BOHN'S STANDARD LIBRARY.

Post 8vo., Elegantly Printed, and bound in Cloth, at 3s. 6d. per Vol.

1 THE MISCELLANEOUS WORKS AND REMAINS OF THE REV. ROBERT HALL, with Memoir by DR. GREGORY, and Essay by JOHN FOSTER. *Portrait.*

2 & 3. ROSCOE'S LIFE AND PONTIFICATE OF LEO X., Edited by his Son, with the Copyright Notes, Documents, &c. In 2 Vols. *Portraits.*

4. SCHLEGEL'S LECTURES ON THE PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY. Translated from the German, with a Memoir by J. B. ROBERTSON, Esq. *Portrait.*

5 & 6. SISMONDI'S HISTORY OF THE LITERATURE OF THE SOUTH OF EUROPE. Translated by ROSCOE. In 2 Vols. *Portraits.*

7. ROSCOE'S LIFE OF LORENZO DE MEDICI, with the Copyright Notes, &c.

8. SCHLEGEL'S LECTURES ON DRAMATIC LITERATURE. *Portrait.*

6.29.06.

Library of the Theological Seminary,

PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by Rev. Wm. B. Scarborough.

Division D102

Section M64

V. 2

29. SHERIDAN'S DRAMATIC WORKS AND LIFE.

31. GOETHE'S WORKS. Vol. I. [His Autobiography. 13 Books.] *Portrait.*

35. WHEATLEY ON THE COMMON PRAYER. *Frontispiece.*

37, 39, 40, 81, & 86. MILTON'S PROSE WORKS. In 5 Vols, with general Index and *Portraits.*

38, 41, & 45. MENZEL'S HISTORY OF GERMANY. Complete in 3 Vols. *Portrait.*

42. SCHLEGEL'S ÆSTHETIC AND MISCELLANEOUS WORKS.

43. GOETHE'S WORKS. Vol. II. [Remainder of his Autobiography, and Travels.]

44. SCHILLER'S WORKS. Vol. IV. ["The Robbers," "Fiesko," "Love and Intrigue," and "The Ghost-Seer."] Translated by HENRY G. BOHN.

46. SCHLEGEL'S LECTURES ON MODERN HISTORY.

47. LAMARTINE'S HISTORY OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION OF 1848.

48 & 50. JUNIUS'S LETTERS, with Notes, Additions, Essay, Index, &c. 2 Vols.

49, 55, 60, 65, 71. VASARI'S LIVES OF THE MOST CELEBRATED PAINTERS, SCULPTORS, AND ARCHITECTS. Translated by MRS. FOSTER, with Notes. Complete in 5 Vols., with Index.

51. TAYLOR'S (JEREMY) HOLY LIVING AND DYING. *Portrait.*

52. GOETHE'S WORKS. Vol. III. ["Faust," "Iphigenia," "Torquato Tasso," and "Egmont."] Translated by MISS SWANWICK. With "Goetz von Berlichingen," translated by SIR WALTER SCOTT.

53, 56, 58, 61, 66, 67, 75, & 82. NEANDER'S CHURCH HISTORY. Carefully revised by the REV. A. J. W. MORRISON. 8 Vols. With Index.

54. NEANDER'S LIFE OF CHRIST.

57, 64. NEANDER'S PLANTING OF CHRISTIANITY, & ANTIGNOSTIKUS, 2 Vols.

59. GREGORY'S (DR.) LETTERS ON THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

62 & 63. JAMES' (G. P. R.) LOUIS XIV. Complete in 2 Vols. *Portraits.*

68 & 70. SIR JOSHUA REYNOLDS' LITERARY WORKS, with Memoir, 2 Vols. *Port.*

69. ANDREW FULLER'S PRINCIPAL WORKS. *Portrait.*

72. BUTLER'S ANALOGY OF RELIGION, AND SERMONS, with Notes, &c. *Portrait.*

73. MISS BREMER'S WORKS. Translated by MARY HOWITT. New Edition, revised. Vol. I. ["The Neighbours," and other Tales.] Post 8vo. *Portrait.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

74. NEANDER'S MEMORIALS OF CHRISTIAN LIFE IN THE EARLY AND MIDDLE AGES (including his "Light in Dark Places"). Post 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

76. MISS BREMER'S WORKS, by MARY HOWITT. Vol. II. "The President's Daughters." *Portrait.*

77 & 80. JOHN FOSTER'S LIFE AND CORRESPONDENCE, edited by J. E. RYLAND. In 2 Volumes. *Portrait.*

78. BACON'S ESSAYS, APOPHTHEGMS, WISDOM OF THE ANCIENTS, NEW ATALANTIS, AND HENRY VII., with Dissertation and Notes. *Portrait.*

79. GUIZOT'S HISTORY OF REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT, translated from the French by A. R. SCOBLE. With Index.

83. MISS BREMER'S WORKS, by MARY HOWITT. Vol. III. "The Home, and Strife and Peace."

84. DE LOLME ON THE CONSTITUTION OF ENGLAND, or, Account of the English Government; edited, with Life and Notes, by JOHN MACGREGOR, M.P.

85. HISTORY OF THE HOUSE OF AUSTRIA, from 1792 to the present time; in continuation of COXE. *Portrait of the present Emperor.*

87 & 88. FOSTER'S LECTURES, edited by J. E. RYLAND. 2 vols.

89. MISS BREMER'S WORKS, by MARY HOWITT, Vol IV. "A Diary; The H——— Family; The Solitary; The Comforter; Axel and Anna; and a Letter about Suppers."

90. SMITH'S (ADAM) THEORY OF MORAL SENTIMENTS; and "Essay on the First Formation of Languages," with Memoir by DUGALD STEWART.

91, 95, 96, 99, 102, 103, 105, & 106. COWPER'S COMPLETE WORKS, Edited by SOUTHEY; comprising his Poems, Correspondence, and Translations, with Southey's Memoir. *With 50 Engravings on Steel.* Complete in 8 vols.

92. **DANUBIAN PROVINCES.**—RANKE'S History of Servia, The Servian Revolution, The Insurrection in Bosnia, and The Slave Provinces of Turkey. Translated by MRS. KERR.

93. **GOETHE'S ELECTIVE AFFINITIES, SORROWS OF WERTHER, GERMAN EMIGRANTS, GOOD WOMEN;** and **A NOUVELETTE.**

94. **THE CARAFAS OF MADDALONI:** Naples under Spanish Dominion. Translated from the German of ALFRED DE ROUMONT. *Portrait of Masaniello.*

97 & 109. **CONDÉ'S HISTORY OF THE ARABS IN SPAIN.** Translated from the Spanish by MRS. FOSTER. In 3 vols. Vols. I. and II. *Frontispiece.*

98 & 104. **LOCKE'S PHILOSOPHICAL WORKS,** containing the Essay on the Human Understanding, the Conduct of the Understanding, &c., with Notes by J. A. ST. JOHN, Esq. General Index and a *Portrait.* In 2 vols.

100. **HUNGARY: ITS HISTORY AND REVOLUTIONS.** With a copious Memoir of KOSSUTH, from new and authentic sources. *Portrait of Kossuth.*

101. **HISTORY OF RUSSIA** to the present time, compiled from KARAMSIN, TOOKE, and SEGUR, by W. K. KELLY. In 2 vols. Vol. I., *Portrait of Catherine the Second.*

107 & 108. **JAMES'S (G. P. R.), LIFE OF RICHARD CŒUR DE LION,** King of England. New Edition, with portraits of Richard, and Philip Augustus. Complete in 2 vols.

BOHN'S EXTRA VOLUMES.

Uniform with the STANDARD LIBRARY, *price* 3*s.* 6*d.*

1. **GRAMMONT'S MEMOIRS OF THE COURT OF CHARLES II.** *Portrait.*
2 & 3. **RABELAIS' WORKS.** Complete in 2 Vols. *Portrait.*
4. **COUNT HAMILTON'S FAIRY TALES.** *Portrait.*
5. **BOCCACCIO'S DECAMERON,** a complete translation, by W. K. KELLY, Esq. *Portrait.*

UNIFORM WITH THE STANDARD LIBRARY,

BARBAULD'S (MRS.) SELECTIONS FROM THE SPECTATOR, TATLER, GUARDIAN, AND FREEHOLDER. In 2 Vols. 3*s.* 6*d.* per Volume.

BRITISH POETS, from MILTON to KIRKE WHITE, Cabinet Edition, comprising, in a very small but remarkably clear type, as much matter as the sixty volumes of Johnson's Poets. Complete in 4 Vols. *Frontispieces.* 14*s.*

CARY'S TRANSLATION OF DANTE. Extra cloth. 7*s.* 6*d.*

CATTERMOLE'S EVENINGS AT HADDON HALL. 24 exquisite Engravings on Steel, from Designs by himself; the Letter-Press by the BARONESS DE CALABRELLA. Post 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

CHILLINGWORTH'S RELIGION OF PROTESTANTS. 2*s.* 6*d.*

CLASSIC TALES; comprising The Vicar of Wakefield, Elizabeth, Paul and Virginia, Gulliver's Travels, Sterne's Sentimental Journey, Sorrows of Werter, Theodosius and Constantia, Castle of Otranto, and Rasselas. 12mo. 7 *Portraits.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

DEMOSTHENES. Translated by LELAND. *Portrait.* 3*s.*

DICKSON AND MOWBRAY ON POULTRY, Edited by MRS. LOUDON, Illustrations by HARVEY (including the Cochin-China Fowl). 5*s.*

HORACE'S ODES AND EPODES, translated literally and rhythmically, by the REV. W. SEWELL. 3*s.* 6*d.*

IRVING'S (WASHINGTON) WORKS. Complete in 10 Vols., £1 15*s.*, or 3*s.* 6*d.* per Vol.

JOYCE'S SCIENTIFIC DIALOGUES. Greatly Improved Edition, with Questions, &c., by PINNOCK. (Upwards of 600 pages). *Woodcuts.* 5*s.*

JOYCE'S INTRODUCTION TO THE ARTS AND SCIENCES. 5*s.*

LAMARTINE'S HISTORY OF THE RESTORATION, 4 vols., post 8vo., new Edition, with a General Index, and 5 additional *Portraits, viz.*, Lamartine, Talleyrand, Lafayette, Ney, and Louis XVII. Cloth.

LAMARTINE'S THREE MONTHS IN POWER. Sewed, 2*s.*

LAMARTINE'S POETICAL MEDITATIONS AND RELIGIOUS HARMONIES. with Biographical Sketch. *Portrait.* Cloth, 3*s.* 6*d.*

LAWRENCE'S LECTURES ON COMPARATIVE ANATOMY, PHYSIOLOGY, ZOOLOGY, AND THE NATURAL HISTORY OF MAN. *Frontispiece and Plates.* 5*s.*

LILLY'S INTRODUCTION TO ASTROLOGY. A New and Improved Edition, by ZADKIEL, with his Grammar of Astrology, and Tables of Nativities. 5*s.*

LOUDON'S (MRS.) ENTERTAINING NATURALIST, a Description of more than Five Hundred Animals, with Indexes of Scientific and Popular Names. *With upwards of* 500 *Woodcuts, by* BEWICK, HARVEY, &c. Revised and enlarged. 7*s.* 6*d.*

LOWTH'S LECTURES ON THE SACRED POETRY OF THE HEBREWS. 3*s.* 6*d.*

MICHELET'S HISTORY OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION. 4*s.*

MILLER'S PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY. Third Revised and Improved Edition, 4 Volumes, at 3*s.* 6*d.* per Volume.

MITFORD'S (MISS) OUR VILLAGE. 2 Vols., New Edition, *with Woodcuts and beautiful Frontispieces on Steel,* gilt cloth. Each Vol. 5*s.*

NORWAY. A Road Book for Tourists in Norway, with Hints to English Sportsmen and Anglers, by THOMAS FORESTER, Esq. Limp cloth. 2*s.*

PARKES' ELEMENTARY CHEMISTRY. New Edition, revised, 5*s.*

UNIFORM WITH THE STANDARD LIBRARY.

SHAKSPEARE'S PLAYS AND POEMS, with Life, by CHALMERS. In 1 Vol. *3s. 6d.*

———— the same, Embellished with 40 pleasing *Steel Engravings,* elegantly bound in red Turkey cloth, gilt edges. *5s.*

STANDARD LIBRARY CYCLOPÆDIA OF POLITICAL, CONSTITUTIONAL, STATISTICAL, AND FORENSIC KNOWLEDGE. 4 Vols. *3s. 6d.* each.

This work contains as much as eight ordinary octavos. It was first published in another shape by Mr. Charles Knight, under the title of Political Dictionary, at £1 16*s.* The Compiler, MR. GEORGE LONG, is one of the most competent Scholars of the day.

STURM'S MORNING COMMUNINGS WITH GOD. New Edition. *5s.*

UNCLE TOM'S CABIN, with Introductory Remarks by the REV. J. SHERMAN (printed in a large clear type, with head-lines of Contents). *2s. 6d.*

———— The same, on fine paper, with 8 *new Illustrations by* LEECH *and* GILBERT, *and a beautiful Frontispiece by* HINCHLIFF. *3s. 6d.*

THE WIDE, WIDE WORLD, by ELIZABETH WETHERELL. Complete in 1 Vol, *with Frontispiece,* gilt edges. *3s. 6d.*

———— The same, *Illustrated with 9 highly finished Engravings on Steel,* richly bound in cloth, gilt edges. *5s.*

BOHN'S SCIENTIFIC LIBRARY.

Uniform with the STANDARD LIBRARY, *price 5s., (excepting "Cosmos," Kidd, and Whewell, which are 3s. 6d., and Mantell's "Petrifactions," which is 6s.)*

1. **STAUNTON'S CHESS PLAYER'S HAND-BOOK,** *with Diagrams.*
2. **LECTURES ON PAINTING,** by THE ROYAL ACADEMICIANS.
3. 4, 8, & 15. **HUMBOLDT'S COSMOS;** or, Sketch of a Physical Description of the Universe. Translated, with Notes, by E. C. OTTE. In 4 Vols., *with fine Portrait.* This Translation (though published at so low a price) is more complete than any other. The Notes are placed beneath the text. Humboldt's analytical summaries, and the passages hitherto suppressed, are included; and comprehensive Indices subjoined. *3s. 6d.* per Volume.
5. **STAUNTON'S CHESS PLAYER'S COMPANION,** comprising a New Treatise on Odds, a Collection of Match Games, Original Problems, &c.
6. **HAND-BOOK OF GAMES,** by VARIOUS AMATEURS and PROFESSORS.
7. **HUMBOLDT'S VIEWS OF NATURE,** *with coloured view of Chimborazo, &c.*
9. **RICHARDSON'S GEOLOGY, AND PALÆONTOLOGY,** Revised by Dr. WRIGHT, *with upwards of* 400 *Illustrations on Wood.*
10. **STOCKHARDT'S PRINCIPLES OF CHEMISTRY,** Exemplified in Simple Experiments, *with upwards of* 270 *Illustrations.*
11. **DR. G. A. MANTELL'S PETRIFACTIONS AND THEIR TEACHINGS;** A Hand-Book to the Fossils in the British Museum. *Beautiful Wood Engravings. 6s.*

BOHN'S SCIENTIFIC LIBRARY.

12. **AGASSIZ AND GOULD'S COMPARATIVE PHYSIOLOGY.** New and Enlarged Edition, *with nearly* 400 *Illustrations.*
13, 19, & 28. **HUMBOLDT'S PERSONAL NARRATIVE OF HIS TRAVELS IN AMERICA.** With General Index.
14. **PYE SMITH'S GEOLOGY AND SCRIPTURE.** Fifth Edition, with Memoir.
16. **OERSTED'S SOUL IN NATURE, &c.** *Portrait.*
17. **STAUNTON'S CHESS TOURNAMENT,** *with Diagrams.*
18 & 20. **BRIDGEWATER TREATISES.** KIRBY on the History, Habits, and Instincts of Animals; Edited by T. RYMER JONES. In 2 Vols. *Many Illustrations.*
21. **BRIDGEWATER TREATISES.** KIDD On the Adaptation of External Nature to the Physical Condition of Man. 3*s.* 6*d.*
22. **BRIDGEWATER TREATISES.** WHEWELL'S Astronomy and General Physics, considered with reference to Natural Theology. *Portrait of the Earl of Bridgewater.* 3*s.* 6*d.*
23. **SCHOUW'S EARTH, PLANTS, AND MAN,** and **KOBELL'S SKETCHES FROM THE MINERAL KINGDOM,** Translated by A. HENFREY, F.R.S., &c., *with Coloured Map of the Geography of Plants.*
24. **BRIDGEWATER TREATISES.** CHALMERS on the Adaptation of External Nature to the Moral and Intellectual Constitution of Man, with the Author's last Corrections, and Biographical Sketch by the REV. DR. CUMMING.
25. **BACON'S NOVUM ORGANUM AND ADVANCEMENT OF LEARNING.** Complete, with Notes, by J. DEVEY, M.A.
26 & 27. **HUMPHREY'S COIN COLLECTOR'S MANUAL:** a popular introduction to the Study of Coins, ancient and modern; with elaborate Indexes, *and numerous highly-finished Engravings on Wood and Steel,* 2 Vols.
29. **COMTE'S PHILOSOPHY OF THE SCIENCES,** Edited from the 'Cours de Philosophie Positive,' by G. H. LEWES, Esq.
30. **MANTELL'S** (DR.) **GEOLOGICAL EXCURSIONS,** including **THE ISLE OF WIGHT.** New Edition, with Prefatory Note by T. RUPERT JONES, Esq., *numerous beautiful Woodcuts, and a Geological Map.*
31. **HUNT'S POETRY OF SCIENCE;** or, Studies of the Physical Phenomena of Nature. 3rd Edition, revised and enlarged.
32 & 33. **ENNEMOSER'S HISTORY OF MAGIC,** Translated from the German by WILLIAM HOWITT. With an Appendix of the most remarkable and best authenticated Stories of Apparitions, Dreams, Second Sight, Predictions, Divinations, Vampires, Fairies, Table Turning, and Spirit Rapping, &c., by MARY HOWITT. In 2 Vols.
34. **HUNT'S ELEMENTARY PHYSICS;** an Introduction to the Study of Natural Philosophy. New Edition, revised. *Numerous Woodcuts and Coloured Frontispiece.*

BOHN'S ILLUSTRATED LIBRARY.

Uniform with the STANDARD LIBRARY, *at* 5*s. per volume,*

1 to 8. **LODGE'S PORTRAITS OF ILLUSTRIOUS PERSONAGES OF GREAT BRITAIN.** 8 Vols. post 8vo. 240 *Portraits.*
9. **CRUIKSHANK'S THREE COURSES AND DESSERT,** *with* 50 *Illustrations.*
0. **PICKERING'S RACES OF MAN,** *with numerous Portraits (or Coloured* 7*s.* 6*d.*)
11. **KITTO'S SCRIPTURE LANDS, AND BIBLICAL ATLAS,** *with* 24 *Maps, (or Coloured,* 7*s.* 6*d.*)

12. **WHITE'S NATURAL HISTORY OF SELBORNE,** with Notes by SIR WM. JARDINE and others, edited, with large additions, by E. JESSE, Esq. *With* 40 *highly-finished Wood Engravings (Coloured, 7s. 6d.)*

13. **DIDRON'S CHRISTIAN ICONOGRAPHY,** *with* 150 *beautiful Engravings.* In 2 Vols. Vol. I.

14. **REDDING ON WINES.** New and Revised Edition, *with* 20 *beautiful Woodcuts.*

15 & 16. **ALLEN'S BATTLES OF THE BRITISH NAVY.** New Edition. Enlarged by the Author. *Numerous fine Portraits* on Steel. 2 Vols.

17 & 18. **ROME IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.** Fifth Edition, in 2 Vols., *with* 34 *fine Steel Engravings,* and Index.

19. **MAXWELL'S VICTORIES OF WELLINGTON AND THE BRITISH ARMIES,** *with Engravings on Steel.*

20. **LIFE OF WELLINGTON,** by "AN OLD SOLDIER," compiled from the materials of Maxwell, and continued by an eminent Author, with an Account of the Funeral. *With* 18 *highly finished Engravings on Steel.*

21. **MARY AND WM. HOWITT'S STORIES OF ENGLISH AND FOREIGN LIFE,** *with* 20 *beautiful Steel Engravings.*

22. **BECHSTEIN'S CAGE** and **CHAMBER BIRDS,** including SWEET'S Warblers. New Edition, greatly enlarged, *numerous Plates (or Coloured, 7s. 6d.)*

23. **NORWAY AND ITS SCENERY,** comprising PRICE'S Journal, with large Additions and a Road Book. Edited by THOS. FORESTER, Esq. *With* 22 *Illustrations, beautifully Engraved on Steel by Lucas.*

*** The Road Book is sold separately, price 2*s.*

24. **CHINA: PICTORIAL, DESCRIPTIVE, AND HISTORICAL,** with some account of Ava and the Burmese, Siam and Assam. *Illustrated by nearly* 100 *Engravings on Wood.*

25. **PICTORIAL HANDBOOK OF LONDON,** comprising its Antiquities, Architecture, Arts, Manufactures, Trade, Social, Literary, and Scientific Institutions, Exhibitions, and Galleries of Art, &c. *Illustrated with* 205 *Engravings on Wood, and a large and complete Map.*

This volume, of which the former editions were published by Mr. Weale at 9*s.*, contains above 900 pages.

26. **MARY HOWITT'S PICTORIAL CALENDAR OF THE SEASONS,** exhibiting the Pleasures, Pursuits, and Characteristics of Country Life, for every Month in the Year; and embodying the whole of AIKEN'S Calendar of Nature. *Upwards of* 100 *Illustrations.*

27. **DANTE,** translated into English Verse by I. C. WRIGHT, M.A. Third Edition, carefully revised. *Portrait and* 34 *Illustrations on Steel, after* FLAXMAN.

28 & 29. **MUDIE'S BRITISH BIRDS,** or History of the Feathered Tribes of the British Islands. Fifth Edition, revised by W. C. L. MARTIN, Esq. Complete in 2 Vols., *with* 52 *figures of Birds, and* 7 *additional Plates of Eggs.* (*Or, with the Plates Coloured, 7s. 6d.* per Vol.)

30. **TASSO'S JERUSALEM DELIVERED,** translated into English Spenserian verse, with a Life of the Author by J. H. WIFFEN. Fourth Edition. 24 *Engravings by* THURSTON *on Wood, and* 8 *on Steel.*

31. **INDIA: PICTORIAL, DESCRIPTIVE,** and **HISTORICAL,** from the Earliest Times to the Present. *Illustrated by upwards of* 100 *Engravings on Wood, and Map of Hindoostan.*

32. **NICOLINI'S HISTORY OF THE JESUITS:** their Origin, Progress, Doctrines, and Designs. *Portraits of* Loyola, Lainez, Xavier, Borgia, Acquaviva, Père la Chaise, Ricci, and Pope Ganganelli.

33. **ROBINSON CRUSOE,** with Illustrations by STOTHARD and HARVEY, 12 *beautiful Engravings on Steel, and* 74 *on Wood.*

HISTORY,

PHILOSOPHICALLY ILLUSTRATED,

FROM

THE FALL OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE,

TO

THE FRENCH REVOLUTION.

BY

GEORGE MILLER, D.D., M.R.I.A.

VICAR GENERAL OF ARMAGH; FORMERLY FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN, AND LECTURER ON MODERN HISTORY.

Third Edition,

REVISED BY THE AUTHOR.

IN FOUR VOLUMES.—VOL. II.

LONDON:

H. G. BOHN, YORK STREET, COVENT GARDEN.

1853.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME THE SECOND.

PAGE

CHAPTER XIX.—Of the history of chivalry. . . 1

Begun in France in the eleventh century—Military investiture derived from the ancient Germans—First tournament held by the sons of Charlemagne—Two causes of chivalry—Assisted by the worship of the Virgin Mary, and by the hostilities of the Arabs—Its beneficial influences—Its abuses begun early in the twelfth century—Ruined by the invention and use of artillery—Abolished in 1559.

CHAPTER XX.—Of the origin and progress of the crusades. 25

1. Crusade in the year 1096—Jerusalem taken and the kingdom begun, 1099—2. Crusade, 1147—Jerusalem lost and the kingdom ended, 1187—3. Crusade, 1189—4. Crusade, 1203—Latin empire of Constantinople begun, 1204—5. Crusade, 1218—Jerusalem recovered, 1228—Jerusalem finally lost, 1243—6. Crusade, 1248—Latin empire of Constantinople ended, 1261—7. Crusade, 1270—Final expulsion of the Christians from Asia, 1291.

CHAPTER XXI.—Of the consequences of the crusades. . 46

Condemned by Mosheim and Gibbon.

CHAPTER XXII.—Of the history of commerce, from the suppression of the western empire in the year 476, to the commencement of the fourteenth century. . 66

Commerce revived in the year 800—Venice the only city of Italy enjoying an extensive traffic to the end of the ninth century—The trade of Amalfi flourished in the tenth—Pisa and Genoa flourished in the eleventh—Woollen manufacture of the Netherlands flourishing during three centuries, from the year 960—Silver mines of Germany discovered about the year 968—Funding system commenced by Venice about the year 1175—Hanseatic league formed in the year 1241—Bills of exchange introduced by the Roman pontiff, in the year 1255.

PAGE

CHAPTER XXIII.—Of the history of learning, from the suppression of the western empire in the year 476, to the commencement of the fourteenth century. . 90

Ecclesiastical learning cultivated in Ireland in the eighth century—Teachers supplied to the continent—among these, Johannes Scotus Erigena, the founder of the scholastic theology, afterwards improved by Lanfranc and Anselm, and completed by Abeillard—Scientific learning acquired from the Arabs of Spain, by Gerbert, who, in the year 999, became pope, by the name of Sylvester III.—Medical school of Salerno received its knowledge from the Arabs—Mathematics and chemistry also furnished by them—Communication of Arabic poetry probably begun in the year 1085—Lyric poetry of the *troubadours* of France begun towards the close of the eleventh century—Romance-writing of the *trouveurs* of France, towards the middle of the twelfth—Sicilian school of Italian poetry, towards the same time—Many Italian poets before the middle of the thirteenth.

BOOK II.

REVIEW OF MODERN HISTORY FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY TO THE REFORMATION.

CHAPTER I.—Of the history of Italy and Sicily from the establishment of the papal see at Avignon, in the year 1309, to the commencement of the papacy of Leo X. in the year 1513. 130

Negotiations for a *balance of power* in Italy occasioned by the expedition of the German emperor Henry VII. in the year 1312—Decay of the kingdom of Naples begun, 1343—Efforts of Florence provoked by the aggrandisement of Milan, 1369—Territorial aggrandisement of Venice in Italy, 1406—Rise of the Medici in Florence, 1421—French dynasty of Naples superseded by the Spanish dynasty of Sicily, 1442—Treaty negotiated by Lorenzo de Medici against Venice, for maintaining a permanent *balance of power* in Italy, 1480—Death of Lorenzo, 1492—Invasion of Charles VIII. of France, 1494—Invasion of Louis XII. of France, 1499—Naples and Sicily united, under the Spanish family of Sicily, 1503—League of Cambrai formed against Venice, 1508—Government of Rienzi in Rome, 1347—The papacy restored to Rome, 1377—The great schism begun, 1378; terminated, 1429—Power of the papacy restored by the popes Alexander VI. and Julius II.—The papacy alienated from France.

PAGE

CHAPTER II.—Of the history of Germany, from the death of Albert in the year 1308, to the commencement of the reign of Charles V. in the year 1519. . . 158

The states divided into three colleges in the year 1309—The struggle with the papacy ended, and Charles IV. king of Bohemia, emperor, 1347—The *golden bull*, 1356—John Huss began to preach against popery, 1408—Sigismond, king of Hungary and Bohemia, emperor, 1410—Huss put to death, 1415—Hussite war begun, 1419—concluded, 1434—The Austrian dynasty begun, 1437—The Turks began to invade Hungary, 1469—The archduke Maximilian married to the heiress of Burgundy, 1477—Private war abolished; the imperial chamber made permanent; the archduke Philip married to Johanna of Castile, and the Swiss confederacy independent, 1499—The Circles of the empire completed, 1512.

CHAPTER III.—Of the history of Swisserland, from the conspiracy in the year 1307, to the admission of Appenzel, the last of the thirteen cantons, in the year 1513. 177

Conspiracy of the three forest cantons in the year 1307—Lucern admitted, 1332—Zuric admitted, 1351—Glaris and Zug admitted, 1352—Berne admitted, 1353—War of the nobles, 1386—The nobles reduced, 1389—The League of the House of God, 1396—The Grey League, 1424—The League of the Ten Jurisdictions, 1428—The Burgundian war begun, 1474—concluded, 1477—Friburg and Soleure admitted, 1481—The Swiss confederacy independent, 1500—Basle and Shaffhausen admitted, 1501—Appenzel admitted, 1513.

CHAPTER IV.—Of the history of the Spanish peninsula, from the commencement of the fourteenth century to the accession of the emperor Charles V. to the crown of Spain in the year 1516. 198

Portuguese discoveries begun in the year 1410—Naples acquired by Aragon, 1442—Aragon united to Castile, 1479—Troubles of Granada begun, 1483—The Cape of Good Hope passed, 1484—Granada reduced and the West Indies discovered, 1492—Vasques de Gama arrived in India, 1498—Brazil discovered, 1501—The king of Castile and Aragon also king of the two Sicilies, 1503.—Navarre united to Castile and Aragon, 1515—The emperor Charles V. king of Spain and the two Sicilies, 1516.

CHAPTER V.—Of the history of France, from the first meeting of the states general in the year 1303, to the accession of Francis I. in the year 1515. . . 220

War with England begun in the year 1339—*Jacquerie*, and ruins of the states general, 1358—Treaty of Bretigni concluded,

PAGE

1360—Aggrandisement of the parliament—War renewed with England, 1369—Treaty of Troyes concluded, 1420—Henry VI. of England king of France, 1422—Maid of Orleans, 1429—War with England ended, 1457—Territories of the duke of Burgundy, except the duchy, transferred to Austria, 1477—Italian expedition of Charles VIII., 1494—Italian expedition of Louis XII., 1499.

CHAPTER VI.—Of the history of England, from the beginning of the reign of Edward II., in the year 1307, to that of the reign of Henry IV. in the year 1399. . 256

Edward II. king in the year 1307—deposed, 1327, and succeeded by Edward III.—War with France begun, 1339—House of Commons formed, 1343—Wicliffe began to teach in 1360—Richard II. king, 1377—Insurrection of the populace, 1381—First English translation of the bible published by Wicliffe about the same time—The king deposed, 1399.

CHAPTER VII.—Of the history of England, from the beginning of the reign of Henry IV. in the year 1399, to that of the reign of Henry VIII. in the year 1509 . 283

House of Lancaster. Henry IV. king in the year 1399—Henry V. king, 1413—Treaty of Troyes, 1420—Henry VI. king, 1422—War of the two houses begun, 1452—War with France ended, 1457. *House of York.* Edward IV. king, 1461—War of the two houses ended, 1471—Edward V. king, and Richard III. king, 1483. *House of Tudor.* Henry VII. king, 1485.

CHAPTER VIII.—Of the history of Russia, from the building of Kiof in the year 430, to the end of the reign of Ivan III., 1505. 305

Kiof founded in the year 430—Novgorod founded, 450—Reign of Ruric begun, 864—Decline of Russia begun, 1015—Domination of the Tatars begun, 1243—terminated by Ivan III., 1462.

CHAPTER IX.—Of the history of Poland, from the year 964 to the commencement of the reign of Sigismond I., in the year 1507. 323

Miecislaus, or Mieskri, king of Poland in the year 964—Casimir the Great king, 1333—The crown became elective, 1370. The Lithuanian dynasty and union of Lithuania begun, 1386—The Teutonic knights reduced, 1466—Representative members in the national assembly, 1468—The incorporate union of Lithuania, 1501.

PAGE

CHAPTER X.—Of the histories of Denmark, Sweden, and Norway, in the period preceding the dissolution of the Union of Calmar in the year 1524. . . . 340

Danish invasions of Ireland begun in the year 798—Danish invasions of England, 832—Connected history of Denmark, 840—Danes established in Ireland, 845—Connected history of Norway, 885—Rolfr, or Rollo, and his Norwegians, settled in France, 911—Norway conquered by Denmark, 950—Danes reduced in Ireland, 1014—Danes established in England, 1017—Norway independent, and beginning of the connected history of Sweden, 1035—England abandoned by the Danes, and Denmark and Norway united, 1042—Norway again separated, 1047—Improvement of Sweden, 1054—interrupted, 1138—renewed, 1279—interrupted, 1303—Union of Calmar, 1397—finally dissolved, 1524.

CHAPTER XI.—Of the histories of the Turks and Persians, from the suppression of the caliphate in the year 1258, to the accession of Solyman I. to the throne of Turkey in the year 1520. 363

The empire of the Moguls divided in the year 1259—The Ottoman government begun, 1301—The Ottomans invaded Europe, 1341—Bajazet overthrown by Tamerlane, 1402—Constantinople taken, 1453—The dynasty of the Sophis begun in Persia, 1502—Egypt and Syria reduced by the Ottomans, 1517.

CHAPTER XII.—Of the history of commerce, from the commencement of the fourteenth century to the peace of Noyon, concluded in the year 1516. . . 388

Woollen manufacture introduced into England in the year 1331—Woollen manufacture in Ireland—Greatest prosperity of the hanseatic league, 1370—The removal of the herring-shoal and the opening of the Zuyder Zee, about 1400—Antwerp considerable in commerce, about 1447—The greater part of the trade of Bruges transferred to Antwerp, about 1487—Indian trade managed by Venice and Genoa—The ascendency of Venice and declension of Genoa begun, 1379—genoa ceased to rival Venice, 1431—The oriental trade of Genoa destroyed by the reduction of Constantinople, 1453—Maritime communication with India discovered by the Portuguese, 1497—Venice attacked at home by the league of Cambrai, concluded, 1508—Origin of the piratical states of Barbary, 1499—The war of the league of Cambrai terminated by the peace of Noyon, 1516

PAGE

CHAPTER XIII.—Of the history of learning, from the commencement of the fourteenth century to that of the papacy of Leo X., in the year 1513. . . . 406

Dante began his Divina Commedia, in the year 1301—Petrarch born, 1304—Boccacio, the father of Italian prose, born 1313—Greek literature revived in Italy, and Italian literature neglected, in the fifteenth century—Italian literature recovered by Lorenzo de Medici—French poetry fallen into decay, 1310—Chaucer, the first English poet, born before the middle of the fourteenth century—English poetry neglected after him—Dunbar, a Scotish poet, born, 1465—The philosophy of Plato, introduced with Greek literature, was formally revived in Italy about the middle of the fifteenth century by Cosmo de Medici.

CHAPTER XIV.—Of several independent occurrences and usuages of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. . 430

CHAPTER XV.—Of the predispositions to the Reformation. 450

MODERN HISTORY.

CHAPTER XIX.

Of the history of Chivalry.

Begun in France in the eleventh century—Military investiture derived from the ancient Germans—First tournament held by the sons of Charlemagne—Two causes of chivalry—Assisted by the worship of the Virgin Mary, and by the hostilities of the Arabs—Its beneficial influences—Its abuses began early in the twelfth century—Ruined by the invention and use of artillery—Abolished in 1559.

While the principal states of the west were separately assuming the forms best accommodated to their subsequent relations, agencies of various kinds were affecting the general frame of European society, and assisting the development of the system, in which its maturity was afterwards displayed. These were the institution of chivalry, the expeditions distinguished by the appellation of crusades, the revival of commercial intercourse, and the first beginnings of the restoration of learning. The subject of the present chapter is accordingly the institution of chivalry, which has so remarkably characterised the history of the middle ages, and so decisively influenced the social arrangements of Europe.

The ridicule incurred by the extravagances of chivalry, when the ages to which it was accommodated had passed away, and the institution itself had degenerated from its original principles, long caused it to be regarded as a remarkable example of the capricious absurdity of the human mind, arising from no settled principles of manners, and inducing no beneficial modification of the intercourses of society and the relations of political order. More modern

writers, however, have considered this subject with a more philosophical spirit; and, while they have traced the institution to the peculiarities of that state of society in which it was begun, they have also discerned, that it has exercised a most important influence in improving the social, and even the political arrangements of the Europeans. If, indeed, we would select that distinction, which has most remarkably discriminated the social habits of the modern Europeans, we should fix on chivalry, for no similar institution has ever existed, either among the nations of antiquity[1], or among the modern orientals[2], though some traces of the feudal system of government, with which it appears to have been connected, have been discovered in the monarchies of Asia.

[1] Mr. Hallam, indeed has described the Achilles of Homer as the representative of chivalry in its most general form, with all its sincerity and unyielding rectitude, all its courtesies and munificence.—State of Europe, during the Middle Ages, vol. ii. page 541. Lond. 1818. Horace would certainly pronounce a different judgment; and though, perhaps, the pliant courtier of Augustus was not well qualified to appreciate the fierce dignity of the Grecian hero, yet even Mr. Hallam has admitted into the description of it an indifference to the cause in which he was engaged, a quality irreconcilable to the loyalty, which was most characteristic of the true chevalier. This loyalty, too, comprehended a faithful attachment to some female, the object of the respectful affection of the knight, a disposition very foreign from the character of him, who spoke of his fair captive only as his prize, and, while he reluctantly relinquished her to the superior power of Agamemnon, declared that he was still ready to fight for any other part of his property. The two principal personages of the Iliad are, as Mr. H. has justly remarked, representatives of the heroic character in its two leading varieties, of a high-minded independence, and of a moral and social magnanimity: but the former was too wild and ferocious, the latter too reasonable, for modern chivalry; nor can we find in either that principle of devotion, which, with all its superstition and absurdity, exalted the character of knighthood to some degree of spiritual elevation. [2] Richardson, in his Dissertation, on the Eastern Nations, Part I. ch. iii. § 5, has pointed out some traces of chivalry in the east, but only of the military part of the system. His account of the deference shown to women in the contests of the knights, is taken from the romances of the Moors of Spain, who probably imitated the Christians of Europe. Sir John Malcolm has borne a strong testimony to the chivalrous spirit which he alleges to have prevailed among the ancient Persians during the whole continuance of the Kaianian dynasty, founded by Kai Kobad, the Dejoces of the Greek writers, and overthrown by Alexander the Great; and has particularly noticed the great respect in which the female sex was held, as the principal cause of the progress which the Persians had made in civi-

St. Palaye, who has given the most complete and distinct account of this extraordinary institution[3], has declared his opinion to be, that it would be difficult to trace it to an epoch more ancient than the eleventh century, and has ascribed its immediate origin to the aggrandisement of the French barons, as it existed at the beginning of the third, or Capetian dynasty, of the sovereigns of France. Chivalry, he remarks considered merely as the ceremony by which a youthful warrior was presented with his arms, was practised in the time of Charlemagne, and may even be discovered in the account, which Tacitus has given of the northern conquerors of the empire. But, considered as a dignity which conferred the first rank[4] in the military order, and was bestowed with a species of investiture[5], accom-

lization.—Hist. of Persia, vol. i. pp. 269, 270. But this testimony rests on the authority of Ferdosi, a poetical historian, who, Sir John Malcolm admits, may have indulged his imagination in the embellishment of his subject, and who, though he died in the year of the hegira 411, and therefore composed his poem just before the commencement of the European chivalry, wrote, however, many centuries after the events which he has described; and probably found in his own fancy the ideal forms of the manners, which he has attributed to the ancient Persians, as the Grecian Xenophon appears to have invented the interesting episode of Panthea for his historical romance of Cyrus. Sir John Malcolm, indeed, has added, that a rank equal to that of males was secured to the women by the ordinances of Zoroaster; but the Zend, the principal of the works still extant which have been attributed to Zoroaster, was probably written, says Brucker, about the time when many Jews and Christians resided among the Persians, that is, about the fourth or fifth century; and the others which yet remain are, by the historian of philosophy, supposed to have been composed at a later period from the tenets of Jews and Mohammedans, for the purpose of appeasing the Mohammedan persecutors of the worshippers of fire.—Hist. Crit. Philos., lib. ii. cap. iii. § 3, 4, cum Append.

[3] Mém. de l'Acad. des Inscriptions, tome xx. [4] Every knight ranked as the leader of a thousand men. [5] This solemn investiture seems to have been introduced in a desire of strengthening the feudal obligations, by adding to the ceremony of homage that of receiving arms; perhaps the chieftains also procured in this manner other followers besides their own vassals, who might give a less limited attendance. In its ceremonies, almost all authors, says St. Palaye, have remarked a relation to those observed by the church in the administration of the sacrament. The most ancient panegyrists of chivalry speak of its engagements as of those of the monastic order, and even of the priesthood, and seem desirous of placing it on the same level with the prelacy.

panied by certain religious ceremonies and a solemn oath, it cannot be derived from a period antecedent to that, in which the kingdom of France began to assume a regular form, after the confusion attending the extinction of the second, or Carlovingian, race of princes. Hugh Capet, who began the third race, was placed on the throne towards the conclusion of the tenth century; and in the following, by a combination of various causes, was formed a system of manners, which blended with the violence of anarchy the refinement of civilization.

The independence enjoyed by the French barons at the beginning of the third dynasty, disposed every noble to emulate in his castle the pomp of his sovereign, which the augmented authority of the crown had begun to render respectable. In every district, accordingly, the ceremony of a court was ostentatiously maintained, and each of these numerous courts became a school of manners, in which the young nobility received education. As the king appointed to the offices of his court the princes of his family, so every noble distributed those of his establishment among his own relatives, who were gratified in discharging even menial duties. In the course of the attendance which these offices required, the young nobles were trained to the accomplishments of chivalry, and at the age of twenty-one years became entitled to receive the honourable distinction of knighthood. The peculiar characteristic of the manners of a knight bears attestation to this original of the institution, the quality of courtesy[6], which was inculcated with extraordinary attention, having received its name from the courts in which it was acquired, as the less polished quality of urbanity, or civility, was so denominated from the comparative refinement observable in the inhabitants of towns.

The rival ceremoniousness of these numerous courts can, however, be regarded only as having provided circumstances favourable to the formation of this peculiar system

[6] Thus, says Spenser, book vi. ch. i. § 1—

'Of court it seems men courtesie do call,
For that it there most useth to abound!
And well beseemeth that in prince's hall
That virtue should be plentifully found,
Which of all goodly manners is the ground,
And root of civil conversation.'

of manners. The causes, from the operation of which, in these circumstances, it derived its existence, were of a distinct and various nature; nor can we reasonably suppose that, without their influence, the feudal nobles would have exhibited in their castles any other example, than that of a rude and licentious luxury.

Tacitus has informed us[7], that the youth of the Germans did not presume to bear arms, until they had been publicly presented with them by some person of distinction, or by some near relative. This kind of investiture appears to have been retained both by the Goths and Lombards, after they had been established within the limits of the empire. Zeno, the Greek emperor, adopted, as his son-at-arms, Theodoric[8], the founder of the Gothic kingdom of Italy, which example was imitated by Justin I., in regard to the same prince. In these instances the German investiture was combined with a relation of adoption, which gave being to a close connexion between the two individuals. It appears, however, from a remarkable story related by Paul Warnefride[9], that among the Lombards, though the ceremony of military investiture was retained, no obligation of mutual attachment could be conceived to have been imposed. The son of their king Alboin, who was himself afterwards the founder of the Lombard kingdom of Italy, was declared to be incapable of dining with his father, though he had been distinguished by a recent victory, until he should have received arms from the king of some foreign nation. To conform, therefore, to the inviolable usage of his country, the young prince, resorting to that very prince whom he had just before defeated, and whose son he had himself slain in the engagement, committed himself boldly to his hospitality, demanded the investiture of a soldier, and was dismissed by the father in the arms of the slaughtered son. The mere investiture seems to have been the whole of the German custom, and the Greek emperors to have added the adoption, in the hope of conciliating the friendship of Theodoric.

Though the origin of knighthood is thus discoverable in

[7] De Mor. Germ., cap. xiii.

[8] Abrégé Chron. de l'Hist. d' Italie, tome i. pp. 31—49.

[9] De Gestis Langobardorum, cap. xxiii., xxiv.

the primitive manners of the Germans, yet we can find but a slight and imperfect rudiment of the jousts and tournaments, in which the emulation of chivalry was exercised. The investiture appears to have been adopted as a necessary precaution against the admission of insufficient persons into the armies; but the frequent hostilities of these nations probably afforded opportunity so ample for the indulgence of military ardour, that the imitation of war was not necessary for their amusement. They accordingly sought their recreation, not in a combat, but in a sort of military dance[10], performed amidst swords and spears by naked youths, while the mimicry of battle was reserved to be an entertainment for a period of more settled order, in which the reality was less frequently witnessed.

To arrive at the period of jousts and tournaments, we must descend through an interval of seven centuries; our first account of a tournament being that of one which was solemnly held by the sons of Charlemagne. The invention, indeed, was even then imperfect, being at that time a mock fight between two bodies of men, not a trial of skill between contending combatants[11]. This was gradually improved, and subjected to numerous regulations. Many authors have ascribed the invention of these regulations to Geoffrey of Preuilli, who died in the year 1066; but St. Palaye was of opinion, that he only methodised those which already existed, perhaps introducing some improvement.

A military spirit, however, had it operated alone, would have produced a very defective resemblance of modern chivalry. In a rude and unsettled state of society, indeed, individuals may be prompted to generous exertions for the preservation of the public tranquillity; and accordingly we find that, among the petty governments of ancient Greece, which, in the distribution of the country into a multitude of little states, corresponded in some measure to the distribution of modern France among the barons, some persons did appear, who devoted their exertions to the suppression of violence. But how far the Hercules and Theseus of

[10] De Mor. Germ., cap. xxiv. [11] The joust was a single combat; the tournament, properly so named, represented a skirmish, being a contest of two equal parties; the *combat à la foule* corresponded to a general engagement.

ancient Greece were removed from the refinement of modern Europe, is sufficiently apparent. Lawless themselves, they seem to have proposed to repress all outrages except their own, and to claim a monopoly of injury. This was, indeed, not unfrequently the just description of the modern knight; but such conduct was a violation of the acknowledged principle of his order. The knights of antiquity, on the contrary, made no professions, but blindly obeyed the impulse, which urged them to encounter violence wherever it presented itself, and equally excited them to perpetrate offences, similar to those which they punished. We may conclude, that the chivalry of modern Europe would have proved to be of the latter description, if other causes had not operated to soften and to exalt that warlike spirit, which had been cherished by the disorders of a turbulent period.

One of these co-operating and modifying causes was the respect for the female sex, which has characterised the modern nations of Europe; another was the influence of the Christian religion. Courage, gallantry, and religion, formed the regular combination of the knightly character, however in particular instances courage may have so far prevailed over the other ingredients, as to become mere ferocity, or courage and gallantry, predominating over the virtuous principles communicated by religion, may have exhibited only a licentious heroism.

The due regulation of the intercourse of the sexes is a problem in the combinations of society, which neither Greeks nor Romans had been able to resolve. Though Aristotle[12] maintains, that the Greeks did not imitate the example of the barbarians, who regarded their women as their slaves, yet the virtuous part of them were notwithstanding excluded from all consideration in society, as the mere managers of the domestic concerns of the men. The popular Pericles[13], in a public harangue, in which he excited his own sex to the emulation of patriotic heroism, dismissed the Athenian women with a cold and contemptuous admonition, that it would be their great glory not to be worse than nature had made them, and that as little as possible, either of praise or blame, should be said about

[12] Polit., lib. i. cap. ii. [13] Thucyd., lib. ii. cap. xlv.

them among the men. He, indeed, found in Aspasia the social gratification, which he appears to have thought the virtuous part of the sex incapable of affording, and for which they were in truth disqualified by the domestic habits of the Greeks. While virtuous women were secluded from general society and abandoned to ignorance, the minds of courtesans were improved by the intercourse of genius, and even of philosophy; nor could Grecian ingenuity ever attain to the formation of a system of manners, which should reconcile the virtue of the female sex with the acquisition and the exercise of the talents of refined and elegant society. In the comedies of Terence, who copied from Menander the manners of the Athenians, we find no representation of a virtuous female fitted to interest the affections; and where he appears to have attempted to create such an interest[14], he has only contrasted the character of a young woman in a state of concubinage with that of a common prostitute. The Medea of Euripides also affords abundant attestation of the despised and abused condition of females in Grecian society; and Aristotle[15] himself, speaking of the choice of characters in reference to dramatic composition, mentions women with slaves, admitting, however, that of these classes the former is only inferior, the latter wholly vile. The matrons of Rome held a higher rank in society than those of Greece, probably because the Romans were almost constantly engaged in war, and therefore compelled to admit their females to a partnership in their domestic concerns. This higher rank they long continued to hold with dignity, discharging with credit the offices of domestic life; but the general intercourse could not be said to have been then begun, and the women were a portion of the republic only as they were members of their respective families. When the Roman women had ceased to be wholly domestic, the imperfection of the social system became apparent. Female manners became corrupted to such a degree, that Augustus was forced to discourage celibacy by law; and the pictures of female profligacy, presented by the satirist, are too offensive to decency for modern inspection.

That women were held in respect by the ancient Germans,

[14] Heautontim, act ii. sc. 4. [15] Περι Ποιητικης, κεφ ιέ.

may perhaps be explained from the analogy of their circumstances to those of the heroic times of ancient Greece[16], in which the women enjoyed more freedom of communication with the men, both in business and in amusement, than in succeeding ages. Some degree of equality might therefore subsist between the two sexes amidst the simplicity of the barbarian tribes of Germany, especially as they possessed slaves for the performance of the laborious offices of agriculture; and the influence of a colder climate, by moderating the passions of the northern warriors, would preserve the female character from being degraded by licentiousness. In such circumstances appears to have been formed that respect for the sex, which has been noticed by Tacitus[17] as characteristic of the primitive manners of Germany, though he represents the females as then living in seclusion. In the progress of civilisation, this cold respect of the barbarian tribes was improved into a desire of becoming the objects of female favour by martial achievements, and thus some advance was made towards the chivalry of a later period; for we find this sentiment expressed in the death-song[18] of Regner Lodbroc, who

[16] Mitford's History of Greece, vol. i. p. 188. [17] De Mor. Germ., cap. viii. 18. [18] This curious ode has been translated freely into the English, and literally into the Latin language, by the Rev. J. Johnstone, who had been chaplain to the British minister in Denmark. The northern hero, after various adventures, had been made prisoner by Ella, a Northumbrian prince, and having been condemned to die by the bite of vipers, is said to have consoled himself, in the agony of approaching death, with singing the *Lodbrokar-quida*, or death-song of Lodbroc. This recapitulation of his former triumphs he begins with mentioning an expedition to Gothland, in which he obtained as his prize his wife Thora, whom in that enterprise he released from captivity. In the nineteenth strophe, describing an expedition to Ila, long the residence of the kings of the isles, he speaks of his antagonists in the language of gallantry; 'With the rising sun we saw the lover of the maid, and the wooer of the widow, fainting beauteous in his locks;' or, 'Comatum amatorem puellæ, et blandiloquum procum viduæ, mane retrocedentem observavi.' In the twenty-third he utters this sentiment: 'Bold should the lover of the fair be seen amidst the battle's whirlwind;' or, 'Inter strepitum gladiorum semper debet blandus amasius virginum imperterritum se præstare.' In the twenty-sixth he says: 'I sought a noble mother for my children; one that might impart adventurous hearts to our posterity;' or, 'Matrem meis liberis quæsivi, quæ eis fortia corda impertiretur.' The Christian religion was first introduced into Denmark in the year

reigned in Denmark about the beginning of the ninth century.

A further progress of society might, however, have produced an effect analogous to the change of manners observed in the history of ancient Greece. As the men became more intimately connected in social and political relations, the women might have been left to sink into insignificance; and thus the very improvement of one part of the species might have been the occasion of such a degradation of the other, as would have hindered it from exceeding the social refinement before attained by that ingenious nation. The great difficulty then is to conceive, how the respect for females, which seem to have belonged only to the heroic ages of society, should have been propagated into the times of civilisation. Among mere savages this respect cannot subsist, because in a merely savage state the peculiar qualities of the female sex can neither be displayed nor appreciated; but neither does a mere advance in civilisation appear to be favourable to the just pretensions of the sex, and some cause must be sought, which supported them among the nations of modern Europe.

The solution of this difficulty seems to be furnished by a consideration of the effect produced by the Christian religion on that society, with which the tribes of Germany were brought into combination. A religion of the heart, while it addressed itself with peculiar power to the gentleness and affection of the female character, exalted in the estimation of the men the very qualities, by which the other sex is distinguished; and as it held out equally to women, as to men, a hope of future happiness, in com-

826. (Mosheim, cent. ix., part i. ch. 1.) The chivalry of Lodbroc was therefore pagan. In the Ode of Harold, a Norwegian prince, who lived about the middle of the eleventh century, the spirit of sentimental attachment is displayed in greater maturity. He complains that all his glory had not been able to conciliate the affection of Elissif, or Elizabeth, the daughter of Jarislaus, king of Russia, concluding each strophe with saying, 'and yet a Russian maiden scorns me.'—Hist. de Dannemarc, par Mallet, introd. 2de partie, pp. 300, 303. Genève, 1787. The chivalrous spirit of this prince may have received some assistance from the influence of Christianity, which had been introduced into his country towards the close of the preceding century.—Ibid., tome iii. p. 115.

parison with which the distinctions of their present existence could possess no importance, it on this account also tended to establish between them an equality of intercourse. The two ingredients of the modern society of Europe, the German tribes and the subjects of the ancient empire, were thus alike, though by different causes, prepared for giving the due consideration to that half of the species, which had been either held in a degrading inferiority of condition, or permitted to disturb the whole order of society by unrestrained licentiousness.

How much religion was instrumental in giving to the female character that importance, which it enjoyed in the ages of chivalry, appears from the accounts which have been transmitted, of the education of the young candidate for the honour of knighthood. His earliest lessons related principally to the love of God and of the ladies; to the ladies was intrusted the charge of teaching him at once his catechism and the art of love; and he was required early to make choice of one of the noblest, the most beautiful, and the most virtuous ladies of the court which he frequented, and to her, as to a superior being, he was bound to communicate not only every action, but even every thought. The lessons of gallantry inculcated in this intercourse, communicated, says St. Palaye, those respectful regards, which, never having been effaced from the minds of the French, have continued to form a distinguishing characteristic of the nation; and he adds, that the instructions which these young persons received in respect to decency, manners, and virtue, made the deeper impression, as they were continually enforced by the example of the ladies, and of the knights whom they served.

The women, respected by the men, were taught to respect themselves; and in the numerous castles of the barons, the younger females were early instructed in the more essential duties, which they should afterwards be required to discharge. The men were even scrutinizing censors of such women, as violated the decorum of their sex. The Chevalier de la Tour, in a letter of advice which he addressed to his daughters in the year 1371, has observed, that it had been customary, in the purer times of chivalry, that the knights should publicly signify their

disapprobation of ladies, whose reputations had been tainted, when these were assembled with others of unblemished characters.

The grand triumph of female influence was displayed in those celebrated tournaments, which occupied so much of the attention of Europe during the period of chivalry. In these exercises, before the eyes of the most distinguished persons of all the courts of Europe, and in the midst of the utmost pomp of decoration, the knights contended for preeminence, in all the varieties of military contest; but the motive, most powerfully exciting them to exertion, was the desire of becoming the chosen objects of female approbation. Sometimes the ladies conducted the combatants to the lists in chains, as their devoted slaves; in all cases the knights, before they engaged, proclaimed aloud the names of the ladies, whose servants they professed themselves, and whose attachment they regarded as a pledge of victory. The favours bestowed by the ladies on their champions, were borne as badges to distinguish them in the field, and most anxiously sought by their antagonists, as the trophies of successful valour. In conferring rewards on the victors, the ladies again acted a conspicuous part, being often the arbiters of their pretensions, and ever the bearers of the prize and the conductors of the pageant. The tournaments were followed by entertainments, in which the ladies enjoyed yet another opportunity of distinction, by presiding in conversations, in which they could exercise and display their mental acquirements, agreeably to the description which Milton has given of these solemnities:

> 'Where throngs of knights and barons bold
> In weeds of peace high triumphs hold,
> With store of ladies, whose bright eyes
> Rain influence, and judge the prize
> Of wit or arms, while both contend
> To win her grace whom all commend.'

Such were the entertainments, which the historian of the Roman empire[19] has pronounced to have been superior to the inventions of classical antiquity, in regard both to the improvement of the public defence, and to the refine-

[19] Decline and Fall, &c. vol. vi. pp. 27, 28.

ment of the public manners. More closely approaching to the reality of war than the contest of the wrestler or the boxer, or even than the combat of the gladiator, they formed a much better preparation of the national defence; and, connecting the two sexes in an intercourse of respectful gallantry, in which each served to meliorate the character of the other, they at the same time constituted a school of moral dignity, fantastic indeed, but admitting no comparison with the ferocity of the Romans, or with the corruption of the Greeks.

In this age of reasoning we might be tempted to deride, as a puerile superstition, that admixture of religion, which gave an ecclesiastical character to the profession of chivalry, if we could forget that, in our own orders of knighthood, we still retain the vestiges of such an incongruity. Superstitious, indeed, may well be called the religion of that ignorant period; but a gross religion alone was adapted to the comprehension of the people of such a period, and, if we consider the particulars of the oath which was sworn by every knight, we shall perceive that, gross and corrupted as it was, it did not fail to inculcate virtues, which tended to improve the human character. The widow, the orphan, and all the defenceless, were entitled by the oath of knighthood to claim protection of the knight, even to the hazard of his life; and every virtue, together with all the graces of behaviour, was solemnly vowed by the candidates for this honourable distinction[20]. In many instances it must have happened, that these obligations were disregarded; but their general influence must, notwithstanding, have produced a considerable effect in moderating the ferocity, and purifying the corruptions, of a turbulent and ignorant society. If many instances of gross licentiousness occur in the history of chivalry, we should recollect that this licentiousness was the disease, of which chivalry, in regulating the intercourse of the two sexes, furnished the appropriate remedy, and that the dis-

[20] The qualities required of a true chevalier were faith, charity, justice, reason, prudence, temperance, strength, truth, liberality, diligence, hope, and courage. In their conversations they often repeated such maxims as this:

Qui bien et mal ne peut souffrir
A grand honneur ne peut venir.

ease must be expected to be found, where the remedy is usefully administered. How necessary it was at such a time, that the religion by which men were to be controlled, should be of a gross and sensible nature, will appear to any person, who reflects on the strange instance of idolatry, in which the ostentatious pageantry of chivalry extended and aggravated the superstitions of the priesthood. The peacock, the pheasant, and the swan[21], from being regarded as the emblems of the parade and pride of chivalry, began to be reverenced even with a religious veneration; and the most solemn engagement by which a knight could be bound, was that in which, with a monstrous and blasphemous absurdity, he took a vow to his Creator, to the Virgin, to the ladies, and to one of these birds.

The connexion formed between religion and gallantry in the system of chivalry, was a natural result of the influence possessed by the clergy, in a time in which that order was the depositary of all the information of every state, and of the interest which the clergy must have felt, in supporting a system promising protection against violence to all the defenceless. But this connexion must have been considerably strengthened by the prevailing idolatry with which the mother of our Lord had already begun to be reverenced, as the most powerful of that multitude of inferior divinities, with which human ignorance and weakness had paganised his church. This superstition[22] seems

[21] When Edward I. had conferred the honour of knighthood upon his eldest son, two swans, adorned with trappings and bells of gold, were brought with great pomp into the church, and the king took a solemn oath by the God of heaven, *and by these swans*, that he would march into Scotland, and never return until he should have avenged the death of John Comyn, and punished the rebellious Scots.—M. Westman, an. 1306. When Constantinople had been reduced by the Turks, in the year 1453, the duke of Burgundy, on two or three occasions, showed a disposition to engage in an expedition against the infidels; and Olivier de la Marche has given an account of the vows which he and the lords of a solemn assembly at Bruges made over *the peacock*, in a magnificent banquet. Abrégé Chron. par Mezeray, tome iv. p. 544. This, which, Mezeray adds, went away in smoke, with the rejoicing of the entertainment, was probably the latest example of this absurd impiety. [22] Mosheim, cent. v. part ii. ch. iv. The doctrine of *the immaculate conception* of the Virgin, by which she was supposed to have been, in her own birth, free from the corruption

to have arisen, in the fifth century, from the oriental controversy concerning the divine and human natures of Christ; those who maintained the unmixed divinity of his character, being disposed to exalt the dignity of his earthly parent, and even distinguishing her by the appellation of *mother of God*. By the Greeks[23] it was adopted with the eagerness of a fanciful and ardent people, delighted to find in religion an object, which they could embellish with the charms of imagination, and cherish with all the warmth of their vehement affections. Though the western Christians appear to have been less powerfully attracted by it than that lively people, yet among them too it was generally established, and it continues to this day to be the favourite devotion of the Roman church. A worship presenting a female as the object of general devotion, however reprehensible in a religious view, must have given much assistance to that social improvement, which was effected by the influence of the female sex, not only as it directly tended to magnify the importance of the female character, but yet more, as it brought religion to the aid of the popular sentiment of gallantry, and gave a spiritualised refinement to that, which might else have been little more than a sexual attachment. This agency, which may be regarded as an example of the adventitious causes, mentioned in the introduction, corresponded well in time to the effect, which it is here supposed to have produced, the worship of the Virgin Mary[24] having attained to its greatest height in the tenth century, the age preceding that to which the com-

of our nature, is said to have been introduced by Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury, in the reigns of William Rufus and Henry I. Ibid., cent. xiii. part ii. ch. xiii. The notion was naturally adopted by the devout gallantry of chivalry, and the knights of Alcantara even swore to maintain it *à outrance*. Heeren sur l'Influence des Croisades, p. 204. Paris, 1808. [23] 'The Greeks, of all Christians in the world, seem to me φιλοθεοτοκωτατοι, *the most zealous worshippers of the mother of God*; the Latins in this matter are extravagant enough, but truly the Greeks far outdo them. In many many instances, which I could give, they ascribe unto her almost as great a providence as to God himself——Infinitely more prayers are made particularly to her than to Christ, and this not only in their private devotions, but in their *euchologion* or common prayer-book itself, and in particular offices appointed for her worship.'—Covel's Account of the present Greek Church, p. 376. Cambr. 1722. [24] Mosheim, cent. 10. part ii. ch. iv.

mencement of chivalry has been assigned. An actual indication of its efficiency, in connecting religion with gallantry, is perceived in the absurd oath of chivalry, in which the Virgin is placed between the Creator and the ladies.

As the adoration of the Virgin Mary assisted in combining a religious sentiment with the gallantry of chivalry, so did political circumstances contribute their aid, to effect a combination of this sentiment with its military character. The Arabs or Saracens, who in the eighth century had conquered Spain, and made a formidable impression upon France, and in the ninth had almost taken possession of Rome, the ecclesiastical capital of the west, had naturally called forth a spirit of military exertion in defence of the church and of religion; and this spirit was maintained in its utmost excitement, both by the wars waged in the east for the deliverance of Palestine, and by the nearer and less interrupted hostilities of the Spanish peninsula. Agreeably to this observation, we find that the romances, which originated from chivalry, and contributed to support its influence, had for their general subject the wars of the Christians against their Mohammedan enemies. Not only that class of these compositions, which took its narratives from the crusades, was of this description, but the exploits, which they record of Charlemagne and his twelve peers, were also directed against the like adversaries, though in France and Spain, and even the wars waged by the British Arthur against the Saxons were converted into contests of a similar nature, his pagan antagonists being represented as Saracens.

The wars waged in Spain against the enemies of Christians, seem indeed to have done more for chivalry, than simply to assist in giving it a character of religious hostility. As in the reciprocal communication of manners, which, in the intervals of their long and obstinate contention, occurred between the adverse nations of the peninsula, the Arabs appear to have received from the Spanish Christians the gallantry and the heroism of this system, so do they appear to have sublimated these parts of its character by the ardency of their more southern temperament, and to have given them back to their antagonists exalted to a degree, to which the sobriety of European imagination

would not have permitted them to reach. In the romantic history of the civil wars of Granada, which is considered as exhibiting a faithful representation of Moorish manners, we accordingly find the utmost exertions of chivalrous heroism, separated indeed from its devotional spirit, because transmitted to persons of a different faith, but combined with even a more enthusiastic admiration of female beauty, because they were already sufficiently disposed to this part of the character.

In this case we discover a remarkable example of adventitious causes, for the influence appears to have been sent back to the place, in which it had been originally formed, increased in its intensity amidst circumstances, among which it probably could not have been originated. The Christians of Spain did not enjoy a sufficient degree of tranquillity, for giving a beginning to a system of manners which was actually formed by a feudal nobility, indulging themselves at ease in the gratifications of some portion of luxury and refinement. The Arabs of Spain, on the other hand, however ardently they might have sought the possession of female beauty, could not have learned, from their native customs, to give to their women such an importance in the competitions of heroism, nor could they have communicated to that heroism the character of a Christian warfare. In France, therefore, it was necessary that chivalry should have its commencement, that country being partitioned among an almost independent nobility, and little exposed to external molestation. But the wars of the Spanish Christians could exalt the crusading part of the chivalrous spirit, when it had been received from their neighbours, and the more southern temperament of the Arabs of Spain could render more vehement the chivalrous admiration of the other sex.

It has been admitted by St. Palaye that, while the laws of chivalry breathed nothing but religion, virtue, honour, and humanity, the ages in which it most flourished were times of profligacy, violence, and barbarism, and that these vices were frequently found in the very persons who professed to observe its regulations. But he has also justly observed in its praise, that no other system was more capable of exciting emulation among the warriors of this

period; that its precepts, however in some particulars imperfect, tended generally to the advancement of order and virtue; that many knights, faithful to the engagements which they had contracted, were accomplished models, not only of the military, but also of the pacific virtues; and that it was an important benefit that, in ages so gross and so corrupted, chivalry should have produced these splendid examples for the general imitation. That it was actually found to operate favourably to public or political virtue, we have indisputable evidence in the efforts employed by sovereign princes and statesmen to restore its principles, when the causes, by which it had been formed and maintained, had ceased to operate, and the system had therefore irrecoverably sunk into decay. In the year 1351, John king of France instituted for this purpose the order of the knights of the star, and his efforts were continued by his son, his grandson, and his great grandson. Francis I., the contemporary and rival of the emperor Charles V., was unquestionably desirous of re-establishing a system to which he appears to have been devotedly attached; but, by conferring its honours[25] on persons of a different description, men distinguished by eminence in the knowledge of the law, or in other learning, he unintentionally counteracted the military principle of the genuine chivalry. The archbishop of Bourges, in his harangue at the closing of the states of the year 1589, recommended its restoration as a measure beneficial to the kingdom.

These persons had in view only the operation of the system in maintaining among the men that spirit of honour, which animated the public strength with a principle more energetic than either civil obedience, or even patriotism, could supply. But its influence in bringing the other sex into the enjoyment of a free intercourse with society, and so regulating that intercourse, as to restrain within sufficient limits the abuses, to which it was exposed, appears to be a consideration deserving yet greater attention. If the female sex be regarded merely as it constitutes one half of the human species, the revolution was of great importance, which placed women in such a

[25] This had indeed been done before, but not in so many instances. The emperor Charles V. bestowed the same honour upon artists.

station in society, as was most favourable to the development of their reasonable and moral qualities. Such a revolution could not, however, be effected in the situation of the one sex, without also exercising a beneficial influence on the character of the other, distinct from that which assisted in forming the factitious spirit of knightly honour. Whatever there is of sentiment in the affection, which men conceive for the other sex, is, in truth, an admiration of the milder virtues of the human character. These a man does not so much reverence in his own sex, because they are associated with an idea of weakness; but in a female, whom he considers as an object to be protected, he can regard them with unqualified respect. The same causes, therefore, which improved the social situation and character of women, must, through them, have worked an advantageous change in the male part of society, not merely by subjecting exterior manners to a more strict regulation, but yet more, by exercising and strengthening the milder affections of our nature, and giving them ascendency over the ferocious dispositions, which are naturally predominant among beings jealous of their strength.

Other beneficial influences may also be ascribed to this system of manners, besides those which have been mentioned. When a haughty nobility at once trampled on the interests of the people, and spurned the authority of the sovereign, it was of great importance that an order of personal merit should be established, which should soften the distinctions of rank, and promote a free and general intercourse among the different orders of society. Chivalry, accordingly, brought knights of every rank into equal and open competition, gave to every individual of the order[26]

[26] 'The privilege of every knight to associate qualified persons to the order, at his pleasure, lasted very long in France, certainly down to the English wars of Charles VII. (Monstrelet, part ii. folio 50), and, if I am not mistaken, down to the time of Francis I. But in England, where the spirit of independence did not prevail so much among the nobility, it soon ceased. Selden mentions one remarkable instance in a writ of 29 Henry III. summoning tenants *in capite* to come and receive knighthood from the king, *ad recipiendum a nobis arma militaria;* and tenants of mesne lords to be knighted by whomsoever they pleased, *ad recipiendum arma de quibuscunque voluerint.* Titles of Honour, p. 792. But soon after this time it became an established principle of our law, that no subject can confer knight-

an equal power of adding new members to its number, and taught even sovereign princes to consider as an honour, that they had been invested with the character of knighthood by private persons, distinguished by the display of those talents and virtues, which that order required. Nor was it merely by affording a fair opportunity of distinction, that chivalry encouraged gentlemen of inferior rank to become competitors in merit with the great nobles, and even with sovereign princes. More substantial benefits were often the reward of their exertions. Liberal donations were frequently made by the princes or wealthy barons, which it was not deemed dishonourable to receive; lucrative appointments in the armies were often bestowed upon private knights, who had displayed superior endowments; and in the troubles of this disorderly period, the female inheritor of a fief not unfrequently found, that, to give her hand to some valiant knight, who should be able to maintain her possession, was the only method of preserving the property, to which she had succeeded. Chivalry also, besides facilitating the intercourse between the different orders of the nobility and gentry, tended likewise to promote a free and amicable communication between the several courts of Europe. The knights of every country were invited to every tournament, and it became a part of the education of a chevalier to visit foreign courts, and to acquire a knowledge of the manners and accomplishments, by which they were distinguished. Another consequence of the prevalence of this spirit was one, which it had in common with the crusades, as it effected a reduction of the resources of the greater nobles, a profuse disregard of money being one of the characteristic qualities of a chevalier, and the enormous[27] expenses of tournaments ruining many of the nobility. The crusades themselves may also be considered as primarily derived from the sentiments of chivalry, which they reciprocally contributed to heighten; and they have been accordingly represented by the historian of the Roman empire[28] as at once

hood, except by the king's authority.'—Hallam's State of Europe during the Middle Ages, vol. ii. p. 558, note. [27] St. Palaye says that they were sometimes encouraged by the princes for this very purpose. [28] Decline and Fall, &c. vol. vi. p. 29.

an effect and a cause of that memorable institution. The spirit of chivalry, from its very origin, partook of the spirit of a religious war, and therefore naturally disposed the minds of men to engage in these great enterprises against the infidels, as, on the other hand, the novel theatre of exertion, presenting new dangers to be encountered, and new opportunities of honourable rivalry, must have furnished additional incitement to that chivalrous spirit, which had prompted the knights of Christendom to undertake the recovery of Palestine.

That knight-errantry, to which attention has been drawn by the satire of Cervantes, does not appear to have been the professed and constant occupation of the real knights of history, however it may have embellished the narratives of romance, the study of which was more particularly the object of his ridicule. Youthful chevaliers did, indeed, adopt a practice of visiting foreign courts, that they might perfect themselves in the accomplishments of knighthood, and in their progress were naturally induced, not only to engage in the wars, which so frequently occurred among the rival chieftains of an unsettled period, but also to interpose for the protection of oppressed individuals, against the violences of the powerful. The adventures which occurred in these progresses, may have prompted others to sally forth for the express purpose of discharging themselves of the obligation, which the oath of knighthood had imposed; but such instances appear to have been rare[29], and to have been exaggerated by the embellishments of the writers of romance.

[29] Mr. Turner (Hist. of Engl., vol. i. p. 137) has quoted a passage from our old satirist, Pierce Plowman, to prove that they actually did roam about for this purpose:—

. . . . Knyghtes shoulde . . .
Ryden and rappe adoune in remes aboute,
And to take trespasseurs and tyen hem faste.
. . . . . .
Trewely to take and treweliche to fyghte
Ys the profession and pure ordre that appendeth to knyghtes.

Edward I., he has also remarked, ibid., p. 136, travelling through Burgundy, attacked the castle of a nobleman, of whom he heard as living by rapine, took it, and, having thus freed the country from the violence of its master, gave it disinterestedly away to the count of Savoy.

Such was that chivalry, which, having arisen in France in the eleventh, continued to flourish through the two succeeding centuries. The combined results of all the various principles, which were then acting upon the people of the west, of the respect with which the barbarians of Germany had treated their women, of the importance given by Christianity to the female character among the nations of the ancient empire, of the favourite superstition, which had constituted a female the object of general adoration, of the feudal independence established among the nobles of France, of the love of arms cherished in the disorder of an unsettled government, of the influence of the clergy interested in exciting champions for the protection of the defenceless, of hostility against the infidel adversaries of the Christian states, and of all the generous feelings of the human character, it was an important agency in the formation of the modern system of Europe. That the age of chivalry is gone, it is indeed folly to regret. Its ideas were exaggerated, and its principles of duty fantastic. But its very extravagancies qualified it to captivate the imaginations of men in a period, in which they were yet children in reason. To us has descended the spirit of the institution, defecated from the folly originally necessary to render it agreeable. The honour of a gentleman is still held in reverence, and the female character is treated with the courtesy of liberal intercourse.

Other causes, acting in other circumstances, have produced an equal, or even a superior politeness of outward behaviour, so that chivalry, though it unquestionably polished the manners of Europe, can maintain no exclusive pretension to the possession of such an influence. The manners of the Turks are more polite than those of other Europeans; and a periodical writer[30], who appears to have been well acquainted with the state of manners among the native inhabitants of Hindostan, has extolled them with the warmest enthusiasm of panegyric. This writer has even alleged the manners of the nobles of the east, as an instance contradictory to the received opinion, that mankind are chiefly indebted, for the reformation of ferocious and uncouth manners, to the influence of female society

[30] Oriental Collections for April, May, and June, 1797.

and chivalry. It must, indeed, be admitted, that the pride, and pomp, and despotism of an Asiatic court, might exhibit a more minute attention to the observances of decorum, though, even in this respect, it may be urged, that the influence of chivalry on manners consisted in introducing politeness among the restless and impetuous Europeans, not among the grave and submissive people of Asia[31].

Nor is the spirit of honourable warfare confined to the institutions of chivalry. The ancient code of Hindostan[32] has prescribed for combatants regulations, which with extraordinary scrupulosity preclude every other advantage, than such as may be obtained in a fair and equal contest, and most humanely limit the carnage of war. This is, however, but a part of the honourable spirit of chivalry and of the remainder the ordinances of Menu are silent, of the generous and uncalculating sense of duty, exceeding the limit of merely legal obligation, and disregarding every other consideration, than that of the consciousness of magnanimous conduct, or of the approbation of men of noble minds. The sense of honour, it must be acknowledged, is but a factitious principle, as it refers the actions of men to no higher standard than their own moral approbation; and Christianity, truly understood, would have taught the people of Europe to seek the sublime of human conduct, rather in referring every action and its issue to the approbation and the disposal of the all-perfect Ruler of the world. But in the imperfect state of religious feeling it was important that men should be taught to elevate their sentiments of duty by other, though factitious and temporary means; that chivalrous honour should inspire a generous fidelity, until religion should have acquired sufficient power over the hearts of men to direct them to a more exalted principle of action, than the opinion of imperfect and erring mortals.

But the characteristic operation of chivalry remains

[31] Mr. Brown has remarked, that impatience, activity, and sanguine hope, are the habits of a European; and that those of an oriental, on the contrary, are indolence, gravity, and patience.—Travels in Africa, &c., p. 426. Lond. 1799. [32] Institutes of Hindoo Law, translated by Sir W. Jones, p. 170. Lond. 1796.

wholly unrivalled, by which it reconciled a free intercourse of the sexes with a sufficient degree of purity in the public morals. This freedom of social intercourse was necessarily liable to very gross abuse; and a system of manners, exalted and enthusiastic, which a reasonable and sober sense of duty would not have prescribed, seems to have been necessary for the support of morality in a crisis, in which the weakness of our nature was exposed to so much danger. Such a system was accordingly supplied by the chivalry of modern Europe, and this is its appropriate praise. Originating in the eleventh century, when the worst period of barbarism had gone by, and society was just beginning to assume a tranquil and regular form, it flourished during the three earlier centuries of returning order, and then gradually declined, as mankind became capable of conducting themselves agreeably to more reasonable principles of action.

Chivalry was naturally exposed to abuses, which prepared its dissolution. These began early, for Peter of Blois, in the twelfth century, described the horses of the knights as laden with the instruments, not of war, but of luxury. Other writers have charged them with all the excesses of an unbridled soldiery. But St. Palaye has remarked, that the very writers, from whom he had quoted the most severe invectives pronounced against the order, gave their eulogies at the same time to the genuine chivalry. That ruin, to which it was thus predisposed, was completed by the invention and use of artillery, which rendered the armour of the knights useless. The institution may be considered as finally abolished in the year 1559, when Henry II. of France was killed in a tournament.

In casting a wide view over the world, it is interesting to reflect that, while the religion of Christ assisted in raising women to a station in society, benefitting them as reasonable and accountable beings, the pretended revelation of the Arabian impostor[33] became to the females of

[33] The opinion, commonly received even among the Turks, that Mohammed denied to women a future existence, has been rejected by D'Herbelot, art. *Gennah*, and has been refuted from the Koran itself by Reland, in his second book on the Mohammedan religion, sect. 18. The truth seems to be that, embarrassed by the introduction of the paradisaical females, whose charms were to reward the

the east the cause of their lowest degradation. It seems as if the improvement of the female part of our species could exist only as a part of a system of general refinement, and that, as the modern nations of the east are all rendered subordinate to the advancement of civilisation in Europe, their women have been reduced to a more humiliating inferiority of condition, because best accommodated to the barbarism, to which these nations have been suffered to descend. A time may, however, be expected to arrive, when the civilisation of Europe, which has been fostered at the expense of Asia, shall be extended over the east, and redeem there also this half of the species from an unworthy bondage, while it qualifies the other to act as the companions of the females, not their masters.

CHAPTER XX.

Of the origin and progress of the Crusades.

1. Crusade in the year 1096—Jerusalem taken and the kingdom begun, 1099. 2. Crusade, 1147—Jerusalem lost and the kingdom ended, 1187. 3. Crusade, 1189. 4. Crusade, 1203—Latin empire

male believers, he did not well know how to dispose of mere women, and therefore said little about them. That they were so slightly treated in his pretended revelation, co-operated with the licentious example of the imposter himself, to effect that extreme degradation of the female character, which has distinguished the Mohammedan nations. Though his own law permitted but four wives, he indulged himself in the liberty of taking a greater number, for authorising which he produced a special revelation. He accordingly married at least twelve women, of which ten were contemporary; and he took also eleven concubines. Some writers extend the number of his wives even to twenty-six.—Hist. of the Arabs, vol. i. pp. 239-244. Like other sensualists he despised the sex, to which he was attached by passion, for the commentators of the Koran have recorded as his saying, that among men there had been many perfect, but four only of the other sex, namely, Asia the wife of Pharaoh, supposed by the Mohammedans to have been a cousin of Moses, Mary the sister of Moses, strangely confounded with the mother of Jesus Christ, Khadijah his first wife, and Fatima his daughter.—D'Herbelot, art. *Asiah* and *Amran*.

of Constantinople, begun, 1204. 5. Crusade, 1218—Jerusalem recovered, 1228—Jerusalem finally lost, 1243. 6. Crusade, 1248—Latin empire of Constantinople ended, 1261. 7. Crusade, 1270—Final expulsion of the Christians from Asia, 1291.

Doctor Robertson[1] has remarked, that the only common enterprise, in which the European nations ever engaged, remains a singular monument of human folly. It deserves to be considered, whether it were not essential to an undertaking, which, without reducing the numerous states of Christendom under the domination of one wide-spread empire, should force into combination the incoherent, and even repulsive materials, of a rude and tumultuary system, that it should result from some temporary extravagance, rather than from a reasonable and permanent policy. In such a period of society it is naturally impossible, that numerous states should agree to co-operate upon any reasonable principle of action; and, even if this were possible, it would not be so advantageous, as the transient influence of a temporary enthusiasm, which, when it had produced its effect, would leave the several governments in the unimpaired enjoyment of their former distinctness and independence. Of this latter description was the principle of the crusades. Though wholly inconsistent with reason, it united during nearly two centuries the principal states of Europe in the pursuit of a common object, and then altogether lost its operation. The states of Europe were, at the close of these two centuries, distinct and independent, however their internal interests and external relations had been permanently modified by the long continuance of their common expeditions.

Wild, however, and extravagant as was the spirit, by which these expeditions were prompted, the preaching of Peter the hermit, which sounded the call to arms, was but the exciting cause, which brought into activity the latent energies of the system of Europe. These were fully prepared for the extraordinary explosion, insomuch that, twenty-two years before it occurred, one superior mind had anticipated their development. The crusades, the great war of the church, were naturally projected by Gregory

[1] Hist. of Charles V., vol. i. p. 30. Lond. 1774.

VII.[2], the founder of the papal monarchy. That pontiff, in the year 1074, declared to the emperor Henry IV., that he was ready to lead an army of fifty thousand men to the deliverance of the Christians of the east. His determination was frustrated by his violent struggle with that emperor, and the commencement of these expeditions was postponed to the year 1096, when they were vigorously undertaken in the pontificate of Urban II.

As in the material world it is an universal law, that every action is encountered by a corresponding reaction, so in the arrangements of policy is every energy opposed by another, which acts with reciprocal and equal influence. It was, therefore, in the regular order of causes and effects, that the strong compression exercised by the Mohammedans on the Christian states of Europe, should at length recoil upon themselves in some general enterprise of hostility, whenever some special excitements should add a temporary power, or favourable circumstances should invite the effort, or at least when the increasing improvement of modern Europe should burst its integuments. Instead then of considering the crusades as temporary and unaccountable extravagancies, we may justly conclude, with the intelligent historian of these expeditions[3], that they must necessarily have occurred.

Their grand and predominant cause was obviously the

[2] The first project of these expeditions has been attributed, but without sufficient reason, to Gerbert, archbishop of Ravenna, who in the year 999 was advanced to the papacy with the name of Sylvester II. He did indeed address a letter in the name of Jerusalem, to the whole Christian church, imploring assistance; the assistance, however, which he solicited, was of a pecuniary nature.—Hist. Franc. Script. à Du Chesne, tome ii. p. 794. Indeed a military aid must have been plainly impracticable, when the Capetian dynasty of France had not yet formed that country into a powerful monarchy, and the Saracens were still established in the southern provinces of Italy. Gregory was excited to conceive it by an embassy, sent by Michael VII., emperor of Greece, to solicit assistance against the Turks, by which he was encouraged to hope, that the termination of the great schism, which separated the Greek and Latin churches, would be a consequence of his interposition.—Esprit des Croisades, tome iii. p. 47. Dijon, 1780. This schism mainly turned upon the question of the procession of the Holy Spirit, the Greeks, after the first council of Constantinople, maintaining that he proceeded only from the Father.

[3] Esprit des Croisades, tome ii. pp. 296, 556.

influence of that ecclesiastical system, which had been gradually formed among the western nations, and had, just before this time, received from Gregory VII. all the improvement of which it was susceptible, until they had themselves, by their reaction on the system from which they sprang, enabled Innocent III. to give it its completion. The ancient penances established by the canons of the church had been, in the eighth century, commuted for pilgrimages to Rome, to Compostella[4], and to Jerusalem, but chiefly to the last of these places, as having been distinguished by the birth, the miracles, and the sufferings of Jesus Christ, and especially towards the close of the tenth, and beginning of the eleventh century, when a notion prevailed that the thousand years mentioned in the Apocalypse had expired, and that Jesus Christ was to appear there to judge the world. While Palestine continued subject to the Arabian caliphs, the resort of pilgrims to Jerusalem had been much facilitated. Aroun al Raschid, the contemporary of Charlemagne, particularly favoured the Christians, and even, for the protection of pilgrims, transferred to that prince the property of Jerusalem. Under the succeeding caliphs, indeed, the Christians were subjected to many exactions; but their pilgrimages were still permitted, as furnishing an opportunity of extorting these payments. By this resort to Palestine, the interest, which the Christians of those ages felt in the immediate scenes of the life of Jesus Christ, was perpetually cherished, while at home superstition was daily increasing its influence, and the hierarchy magnifying its power.

To form an adequate conception of the spirit excited by the operation of this cause on the minds of men, it should be sought, not in any analogy to the habits and sentiments of more modern times, but in the expressions of the troubadours, who exhibited in their poems the feelings of their contemporaries. In their compositions we find passages, which, to Christians of a more civilized and reasonable

[4] A town of Galicia in Spain, held in great veneration as containing the body of James, who was devoutly reverenced by the Spaniards for having introduced among them the knowledge of Christianity, and also because he was supposed to have assisted in gaining an important victory over the Saracens.—Mariana, book iv. ch. i.

period, afford surprising specimens of the extravagancy of the human mind. One of these[5] speaks of a crusade as an expedition undertaken for the recovery of the land of Syria, 'which God had lost:' another[6] remarks, that 'he who dies in a crusade may say to God—If you have died for me, have not I died for you?' and a third[7] observes, that he does not regard him as a knight, who will not go cheerfully, and with all his power, 'to the assistance of God, who is in so great need.'

However strongly the fanaticism of superstition might have affected the minds of Europeans, the circumstances of the western nations would not admit their co-operation in such enterprises at an earlier period, than the conclusion of the eleventh century. Little more than a century had elapsed, since the monarchy of France had almost sunk in dissolution, and Hugh Capet had commenced the new dynasty, by which the power of the crown was gradually recovered and confirmed. Only thirty years had passed, since William the Norman had effected the conquest of England, and begun that new succession under which the constitutional liberties of these countries have been slowly matured. Italy was embarrassed by a domestic war with the Saracens, from the year 820, when they first passed from Africa to Sicily, until the beginning of the eleventh century, at which time the arrival of the Normans freed it from the hostility of that people, but introduced a new enemy in their room; nor yet was the Saracen power removed to a distance until the year 1062, or thirty-four years before the first crusade, when Sicily was reduced by the Normans. Germany, indeed, had enjoyed a more settled and vigorous government during a century from the commencement of the reign of the first Otho, in the year 936, than it afterwards experienced; but this country was never a principal in the expeditions to Palestine, and appears to have been engaged in them chiefly on account of the vicinity of France. Spain occupied by its own long contest with the Saracens, could not have any direct concern with the expeditions against the Mohammedans of the east, though much of the spirit of general hostility against

[5] Hist. Littéraire des Troubadours, tome i p. 374. [6] Ibid., tome ii. p. 20. [7] Ibid., pp. 158, 159.

the infidels was furnished from the protracted struggle of the peninsula.

Nor were the circumstances of the eastern countries less accommodated to the commencement of these great enterprises of the west. Jerusalem was, in the year 1076, taken from the Saracens by a tribe of Turks, and the pilgrims were subjected to outrages of every kind by these fierce barbarians, who had probably been stimulated to the conquest by the hope of plundering the riches, which flowed thither from the west. The indulgence of the Saracen caliphs had encouraged the practice of performing pilgrimages to Jerusalem; and when this practice had arisen to its utmost height, the insupportable oppressions of the Turks served to kindle into fury that enthusiasm, which soon afterwards converted crowds of pilgrims into hosts of invaders.

The historian of the Roman empire has even remarked an adaptation of the time of the commencement of the crusades to the circumstances of the Turkish conquerors of Palestine[8], 'the prudence or fortune of the Franks having delayed,' as he says, 'their invasion till the decline of the Turkish empire.' The Turks had, in the degeneracy of the Arabian empire, been employed for its defence, in the same manner as the barbarians of northern Europe had been received into the armies of Rome; and the mischief of such an expedient was experienced at Bagdad, not less than in the capital of the west. A Seljukian dynasty was at length, in the year 1038, established in Persia[9]; and the Turkish sultan[10], who, with his people, had embraced the religion of Mohammed[11], was soon afterwards constituted the tempo-

[8] Decline and Fall, &c. vol. vi. p. 55. [9] Ibid., vol. v. p. 653. The historian has remarked that Togrel Beg, the grandson of Seljuk, from whom the nation derived its name, expelled the princes of Ghizni from the eastern kingdoms of Persia, and drove them upon India.—Ibid., pp. 654, 655. Thus the great inroad of the Turks influenced at once the fortunes both of the east and of the west of Asia.

[10] The title of solthan, or sultan, signifying *lord*, was invented for Mahmood of Ghizni, who reigned about the end of the tenth century, the ambassador of the caliph choosing to address him by an appellation common to the Arabic and the Chaldaic language. The title emir, signifying *commander*, had been before employed.—D'Herbelot, art. *Solthan*. [11] The historian of the Roman empire remarks on this occasion, that the triumph of the Koran was more pure and

ral lieutenant of the caliph of Bagdad. The new dominion, under three successive sultans of superior energy, became extensive and flourishing. Togrul Beg, the founder, put an end to the anarchy by which Persia had been harassed; Alp Arslan, the second of these princes, effected the acquisition of Armenia and Georgia; and Malek Shah, the third, received from the caliph the sacred title of commander of the faithful, expanded his empire from the borders of China to the neighbourhood of Constantinople and the utmost limit of Arabia, and added to his reign the splendour of restoring the literature of Persia, with the scientific dignity of rectifying the calendar[12]. With Malek Shah, who died in the year 1092, the greatness of this earlier Turkish empire expired, three secondary dynasties becoming detached from the principal, which occupied the throne of Persia. Of these secondary dynasties, one was that of Kerman, an extensive, but obscure and transient sovereignty, on the shore of the Indian ocean; another was that of Syria, which, in the year 1096, effected the reduction of Jerusalem; and the third was that of Roum, established by Soliman in Anatolia, the capital of which was Nice, but one hundred miles distant from Constantinople.

From this detail it is manifest, that the armies of the crusaders could not have made any impression in the time of any one of the three sultans, who possessed the undivided dominions of the Turks, superior as the forces of the latter were in military discipline, while they were equal in courage to the Europeans. But just at the time of the commencement of these expeditions, their power was

meritorious than that of Christianity, as it was not assisted by any visible splendour of worship, which might allure the pagans with some resemblance of their own idolatry.—Decline and Fall, &c. vol. v. p. 646. He has not remarked that the triumph was much easier, as the religion of Mohammed taught no mystery, and required no painful restriction of worldly appetite; and he has forgotten that the resemblance of Pagan idolatry was introduced into Christianity after its triumph had been obtained. [12] The Gelalean year, so named from one of the titles of Malek Shah, is, if any year can be so denominated, truly tropical, or correspondent to the appearances of the sun. It was invented for ascertaining the return of the solemnity of Neuruz, as the Gregorian for that of Easter.—Beveregii Instit. Chron., lib. i. cap. xi. Neuruz or Nevrouz was the appellation of the first day of the year, or the day of the vernal equinox.

paralyzed by the pretensions of the sons of Malek Shah, who contested the succession with his brother, and wrested from his authority three considerable portions of the empire. In this struggle, the caliph of Egypt had seized an opportunity of recovering Jerusalem, which was thus restored to the Saracens; but the Christians, though principally excited to undertake the crusade by the oppressions, which the Turks had exercised upon the pilgrims, determined to prosecute their purpose, and to insist upon obtaining possession of the holy city. In such an adaptation of circumstances, we cannot justly ascribe any thing to the prudence of the enthusiastic crowd, who poured themselves on the east, ignorant of their danger, and trusting to miracles for safety; and fortune, if it be not employed to express those arrangements of a superior and controlling providence, which human wisdom is unable to anticipate, must be a mere sound without a signification. Regarding, however, the events of human history as the parts of one comprehensive moral government, combined by the great author and ruler of our species, we can remark with reverence the traces of a prudence not our own, and of a fitness not fortuitous.

In these circumstances of the Christian and Mohammedan nations, an individual appeared, humble in station, and contemptible in his person[13], but eminently gifted for the especial office of kindling the ardour of fanaticism. Peter the Hermit, himself a fanatic, and endowed with a spontaneous eloquence, best suited to excite in others a spirit similar to his own, having recently visited Jerusalem, and inflamed his imagination with the actual view of the sufferings of the Christians and of the profanation of those objects, which he reverenced as sacred, obtained from the patriarch letters, soliciting the assistance of the princes of

[13] Erat autem hic idem statura pusillus, et quantum ad exteriorem hominem persona contemptibilis. Sed *major in exiguo regnabat corpore virtus*. Vivacis enim ingenii erat, et oculum habens perspicacem, gratumque, et sponte fluens ei non deerat eloquium.—Gulielm, Tyr., lib. i. cap. xi. External meanness seems to have given to his exhortations a more spiritual character. He accordingly affected the most mortified exterior, and would ride only on an ass. The people, reverencing his austere humility, preserved the hairs of his ass as reliques.—Esprit des Croisades, tome iii. pp. 103, 107.

the west. Being a Frenchman, he more easily found access to pope Urban II., who was his countryman; and this pontiff was prepared, both by the previous occurrences of his life, and by his present circumstances, to receive the impression, which Peter desired to communicate. Urban, who had been the friend of Gregory VII.[14], knew with what ardour that pontiff had engaged in such a project, and by what considerations he had been influenced. Alexis, the Greek emperor, had renewed the proposal of uniting the Greek and Latin churches, by which his predecessor had stimulated Gregory to undertake his protection against the Turks; and the pontiff himself had recently been enabled to establish himself in the ecclesiastical capital, from which he had before been excluded by an antipope. The council of Placentia was accordingly convened by Urban, and there the ambassadors of Alexis appealed at once to the policy, and to the devotion of the Latins. Urban, however, who was a Frenchman, depended most on the exertions of his countrymen, and, therefore, assembled a second council at Clermont, where the first crusade was finally determined.

The Roman[15] pontiffs must have been strongly influenced by the hope of terminating the schism separating the Greek and Latin churches, and of extending their supremacy, not only over the whole of Christendom, but also over those countries, which should be conquered, or protected, by the armies of their church. In the progress of these enterprises they discovered the advantages redounding to their temporal authority, from the diminution of the power of sovereigns, whose warriors were thus sent to combat a distant enemy, and from the opportunity of imposing upon those sovereigns themselves, when they should become formidable, the obligation of going in person to the wars of the east.

The nobles of every order, habituated to the practice of

[14] Esprit des Croisades, tome iii. p. 87. [15] Ibid., tome ii. pp. 547, &c. The difference of doctrine, on which this system rested, related to the Holy Spirit, the Greek church, agreeably to the determination of the council of Constantinople, holding that this person of the Trinity proceeded only from the Father. The doctrine of the Roman church concerning this matter was first publicly promulgated in the first council of Toledo.

violence, and recently restrained by[16] *the truce of God*, which the influence of the clergy had caused to be established, must have eagerly embraced a proposal, which permitted them to combine violence with devotion; and the pontiff[17] accordingly, in the council of Clermont, is said to have insisted upon this consideration, as on one fitted to exercise a powerful influence on their minds. They might also be actuated by the expectation of procuring for themselves valuable settlements, when they considered the conquest of Sicily, and of the southern provinces of Italy, which had been recently achieved by a small number of Norman adventurers. The tales of pilgrims and the gifts of commerce had led them to form an excessive estimate of the opulence of the eastern countries, which was rendered yet more extravagant by the boastful exaggerations of the earlier adventurers.

For conceiving the ardour, with which the lower orders of the laity must have engaged in an enterprise carrying them from their homes to a distant and untried scene of action, it is only necessary to reflect on the miserable oppression under which they groaned, and on the common disposition of our nature, to believe that a change of scene would of itself prove a removal of suffering. The advantages, however, enjoyed by those, who engaged in the crusades, were numerous and important. Those who had committed crimes, were enabled to elude the punishments pronounced by secular laws against their offences: debtors were enabled to defy, for the present, the claims of their

[16] See chapter 6, towards the end. [17] 'You will turn,' said the pontiff, 'against the enemy of the Christian name, those swords, which you are incessantly sharpening against each other, which that salutary truce, ordained by our predecessors, has not been able to make you lay aside, and which you must now sheath, if you are not willing to be struck with the anathema, which we have just now launched against every one, who should dare to infringe it. Since you must have blood, bathe yourselves in the blood of infidels, wash away, in this guilty blood, the blood of Christians, with which you are polluted. Oppressors of the widow and of the orphan, robbers, assassins, famished vultures, who have no pleasure but in fields of carnage, behold the moment, when you may prove whether you are animated by a true courage, whether you are warriors or savage tigers, such as you have hitherto shown yourselves.'—Esprit des Crois., tome iii. pp. 143, 144.

creditors, and were also protected from the accumulation of interest during the period of their service: and all of the lower orders enjoyed alike the advantage of emancipating themselves from the burthensome subjection of the vassalage, in which, while at home, they were held by the nobles. The ecclesiastics, on the other hand, hoped for new dignities in the countries, which these expeditions should add to the domains of the ecclesiastical monarchy; and the monks found in them at least an opportunity of releasing themselves from the irksome restraints of their convents.

The grand instrument, which operated on the minds of every class, was the invention of the papal indulgences, that great practical[18] corruption of the Romish church. The bishops had already adopted the practice of commuting the penances of the church for sums of money, which were understood to be applied to religious purposes, partly to the construction of magnificent edifices for the exercise of public worship. When the general war of the church demanded an extraordinary supply of money, this system of ecclesiastical finance was eagerly embraced by the pontiffs, and, in their desire of accumulating the necessary treasures, was extended from an occasional commutation of temporal penalties to a plenary indulgence, and from this even to a remission of the penalties of a future existence. One part of the ancient penances[19] had been a prohibition of carrying arms, and of riding; and, according to the ancient discipline, some penance had been im-

[18] The commutation of ecclesisastical penances for money, was a sufficiently obvious expedient. The difficulty was to extend such a commutation to the punishments of a future life. For this purpose a very extraordinary notion was devised, that of *supererogation*. It was held, that there existed an immense treasure of merit, composed of the good deeds performed by the saints, beyond what was necessary for their own salvation; and that the Roman pontiff, as the guardian of this treasure, possessed the power of assigning to any sinner such a portion of it, as might be sufficient to ensure his future happiness.—Mosheim, cent. xii. part ii. ch. iii. From F. Paul we learn that to the merits of the saints, as they were limited, were added the merits of Jesus Christ, which gave occasion to a doubt of the necessity of introducing the merits of the saints, as those of Jesus Christ were unlimited.—Hist. of the Council of Trent, p. 6, Lond. 1676. From this writer we learn, that indulgences were peculiar to the church of Rome.—Ibid., p. 766. [19] Fleury's fifth Discourse of Eccles. Hist.

posed upon those who had killed men, even in the most just and necessary wars, an example of which occurred after the battle of Fontenoy, fought in the year 841. The plenary indulgence, granted to the crusaders, reconciled the performance of penance with the exercises and violences of war; and by this expedient, which Guibert, a French historian, has denominated a new kind of salvation, the people of Europe were brought to believe that they were enabled to secure their everlasting happiness, without any alteration of their habits and pursuits. The erroneous expectation of the near approach of the end of the world, which had for some time generally prevailed, must have powerfully urged the people of the west to avail themselves of so favourable an opportunity.

Of all the countries of western Europe, France was on this occasion most susceptible of excitement, and therefore from this country more especially the crusades originated. The claim of the German crown to the dominion of Italy, and the consequent contention of the imperial and papal powers, had alienated the Germans from the cause of the pontiffs. The Spaniards, on the other hand, though rendered highly fanatical in their long contest with the Arabs of their own country, were too much occupied with this struggle, to give much attention to expeditions undertaken against more distant infidels. The English, accustomed to the independence of the Saxon times, but recently reduced under the control of a Norman clergy, and in their remote situation never molested by the ravages of the Arabs, felt but a slight and transient interest in the wars of Palestine. The Italians indeed bore a considerable part in these expeditions, but as sutlers and traders, rather than as warriors; and it had been accordingly observed, that in prosecuting them, they were careful to avail themselves of every opportunity of acquiring a favourable station for the extension of their commerce. The domestic divisions of their country had converted religion into policy, and the immediate seat of the papal power was too near to be regarded with superstitious veneration. While these various causes alienated from the contest the other countries of the west, France had been the birth-place of that chivalry, which so much contributed to animate the spirit of the crusades; the feudal government, formed there in

the decline of the Carlovingian dynasty, had imposed on the lower orders a more grievous burden of oppression than in other states, and had thus disposed them to engage more readily in distant and hazardous enterprises; and the character of the French people was then, as it has ever been, ardent and impetuous, easily excited by military ambition, and eager to embrace every novelty. It is remarkable, that the immediate circumstances of the papacy were not favourable to the project of Urban II. At that very time[20] the larger portion of Rome was possessed and fortified by an antipope, and the princes were separated from the church, the people from the princes, by the excommunications, which himself and his predecessors had thundered against the emperor and the king of France. But the general causes, already mentioned, influenced so decisively the minds of men, and the sovereigns[21] were so little able to control the conduct of their vassals, that the schism of the papacy and the alienation of the princes were incapable of opposing any considerable difficulty; and we may even discover an important connexion between such a combination of unfavourable circumstances and the ultimate influence of these memorable expeditions.

It is known that Gregory VII. had proposed to be himself the leader of the army, which he wished to assemble against the infidels of the east; and at the council of Clermont, Urban was solicited to assume the command of the crusaders. The schism[22] was the reason assigned by the latter, which rendered it necessary to devolve the superintendence of his enterprise upon a legate, and may, therefore, be regarded, as having, at least, contributed to hinder the Roman pontiffs from engaging personally in expeditions, of which they were naturally considered as principals and patrons. The circumstances of the sovereigns of France and Germany were probably, in the like manner, the causes, which hindered one or other of these sovereigns from becoming the chief commander of the general army

[20] Decline and Fall, &c., vol. vi. p. 3. [21] The first crusade occurred in the reign of Philip I., in which, as has been already remarked, the general progress of the royal power was suspended. When the duke of Normandy could proceed from the very neighbourhood of his capital to acquire a kingdom for himself, the pontiff might well set him at defiance in a southern province.

[22] Esprit des Croisades, tome iii. p. 159.

of Christendom, and thus acquiring an undue ascendency over the other potentates. These expeditions were accordingly begun under the guidance neither of a pope, nor of a sovereign, and therefore tended to establish neither an ecclesiastical, nor a temporal monarchy of Europe; but, being the spontaneous ebullitions of a popular enthusiasm, in which princes participated only as other individuals, they exercised their influences on the general mass of the society of western Europe, without disturbing the distribution of its parts.

In tracing the progress of these expeditions, which occupied an interval of nearly two centuries, the attention is principally attracted by the formation of two sovereignties, the kingdom of Jerusalem, and the Latin empire of Constantinople, each of which will be found to have been important in the general combination of events.

As the recovery of that city, to which the superstition of the age had attached the idea of a local sanctity, was the grand object of the western Christians, it seems to have been indispensable to their perseverance in so long a struggle, that their hopes should be cherished, and their exertions stimulated, by the acquisition, however insecure and temporary, of a place, which they regarded with so much veneration. It was, accordingly, gained in the third year of that memorable period, and retained during eighty-eight; it was again acquired, after an interval of forty-one years, and held during fifteen. The contention of the Turks and Arabs has been already mentioned, as having facilitated the earlier reduction of Jerusalem; the same contention supported, during eighty-eight years, the tottering sovereignty[23], and, after an interval of forty-one years, restored, for the short period of fifteen, the city to the Latins, though the kingdom was not re-established.

At the end of the former period, the kingdom was overthrown by the celebrated Saladin[24], or rather Sâlâhûdeen,

[23] Decline and Fall, &c., vol. vi. pp. 95, 112.

[24] Saladin, who had been employed in the army of Noureddin, sultan of many places in Syria and Mesopotamia, possessed himself of Egypt, and suppressed the caliphate of that country, in the year 1171. Soon after the death of Noureddin, which occurred in the year 1174, Saladin, who had continued to acknowledge a dependence on his former master, began to seize the towns of Syria, and, in the year 1187, became master of Jerusalem. At his death, which happened in the

who, sixteen years before, had possessed himself of the throne of the caliphs of Egypt, and, with the title of sultan, had succeeded to their power. Its internal situation had, indeed, made ample preparation for its ruin, the city being abandoned to the protection of a leper, a child, a woman, a coward, and a traitor[25]. When Jerusalem was again conquered by the crusaders, in the year 1228, the singular situation of the emperor Frederic II., who had effected the conquest, rendered it impossible for him to restore the former establishment, as he had been followed, even to Palestine, by the papal anathemas, which had been really provoked by his attempts to reduce Italy under his authority, but were alleged to have been issued in punishment of the delay of his expedition to the east, and of his contumacy in departing at length without soliciting absolution. The irruption of a savage horde of Carizmians, who had fled from the borders of the Caspian Sea, before the arms of the Moguls, put a final period, in the year 1283, to the possession of the Latins[26].

year 1193, his dominions of Syria and Egypt were divided among three of his sons, two distinct and rival dynasties being constituted in Upper and Lower Syria, and Egypt forming a separate principality.—D'Herbelot. art. *Salaheddin*. By the division of the dominions of Saladin, the power, which had crushed the Christian kingdom of Jerusalem, was so much reduced, that the hopes and efforts of the crusaders were permitted to revive. That kingdom, however, could be useful only as a temporary excitement of their exertions, which were again stimulated by the desire and the expectation of its re-establishment. The suppression of the Fatimite caliphate of Egypt, which had been a consequence of the ascendency attained by Saladin, prepared that country for its subsequent incorporation into the general empire of the Turks. Its schismatical caliphate had served at once to reduce the power of the Arabian empire, and to maintain a principle of religious division, which should afterwards alienate Persia from the Ottoman government, and control the power of the Turks. The sect of Ali was restored in Persia, towards the end of the fourteenth century, or about two centuries after it had been suppressed in Egypt.

[25] Decline and Fall, &c., vol. vi. p. 96. The leper was Baldwin IV., king of Jerusalem, who, by his disease, was rendered incapable of governing; the woman was his sister, Sybilla, his natural successor; the child was her son, Baldwin V.; the coward was Guy of Lusignan, whom she married, after the suspicious death of her child; the traitor was Raymond, count of Tripoli, who had been irritated by his exclusion from the succession and regency.

[26] Decline and Fall, &c., vol. vi. p. 113.

Seventeen years after the termination of the kingdom of Jerusalem, or the earlier loss of the city, was begun the Latin empire of Constantinople, the other grand incident of these memorable enterprises. Of the seven principal armaments[27], into which the crusades have been divided, the first and second were conducted by land; the third was conducted partly by land and partly by sea, the Germans pursuing the former route, while the French and English proceeded by the latter; the four remaining were wholly naval, the calamities of marching through savage or hostile countries having been severely experienced in the preceding expeditions. It is remarkable, that both methods of conducting these expeditions contributed to the establishment of the Latin empire of Constantinople.

The crusades had been originally undertaken at the solicitation of the Greek emperor, whose Asiatic territory had been conquered, and whose European territory was threatened by the Turks; but the multitude and the licentiousness of his auxiliaries alarmed the emperor, as they successively arrived at Constantinople, in their progress by land to the Hellespont, while[28] the avidity of the Latins was excited by the view of the opulence and luxury of the Greeks. Hence were gradually conceived, on the part of the Greeks, those jealousies and animosities, and on the part of the Latins, those ambitious desires, which, in the year 1204, ended in the seizure of Constantinople and its territory, and the establishment of a Latin empire for fifty-seven years. This crisis was immediately occasioned by the maritime conveyance of the crusaders. Having contracted[29] with the Venetians for the transportation of their troops, but being unable to pay the stipulated sum, they consented to gratify the republic, by employing in the reduction of some revolted cities of Dalmatia those arms, which they had designed to employ only against the ene-

[27] Troops of warriors and pilgrims, often confounded together, went continually to the east in the intervals of the great crusades; these were commonly excited by some remarkable event, as the loss of Edessa, or of Jerusalem. [28] In the book entitled, Gesta Dei per Francos, which is a collection of treatises relative to the crusades, we find the admiration of the Latins very emphatically expressed. Fulcherii Carnet. Gesta Peregr. Franc., and Gesta Franc. Hierus. Expugn., lib. i. [29] Decline and Fall, &c., vol. vi. pp. 143, 165.

mies of their religion; and, having once incurred the scandal of engaging for merely temporal purposes to combat their fellow-christians, they were easily induced to gratify the same enterprising state yet further, by espousing the cause of a fugitive prince of the imperial family, who had solicited its influence in procuring their assistance, for expelling an usurper, and restoring his father to the throne. The city was taken, and the emperor was re-established; but the revolution was soon followed by the subversion of the government. Discontent and animosity speedily arose between the Latins and the Greeks; a new usurpation, immediately succeeded by the assassination of the young prince and the death of the emperor, freed the former from the restraint of their engagement; and a second conquest placed a Latin sovereign on the throne of the eastern empire.

The vices[30] and the incapacity of Isaac Angelus, the last of the series of Greek emperors, had suffered the empire to crumble into ruin. A revolt of the Bulgarians and Walachians, which happened in the year 1186, was provoked by his misconduct, the flocks and herds of these simple people, their only means of subsistence, having been driven away for the celebration of the royal nuptials, and their warriors having been exasperated by a refusal of equal rank and pay in the armies of the empire. The reign of this prince was then agitated by the attempts of various candidates for the throne, which he so unworthily filled, until at length, in the year 1195, he was deposed by his brother, whom the historian, having exhausted, as he says, the language of contempt on the former, contents himself with denominating the baser Alexius. The usurpation sent the son of Isaac, who was also named Alexius, to seek the aid of the Latins, and a second, but transient usurpation, completed the catastrophe of the government.

The new empire was not fitted for a long duration. The imperial territories, recently diminished by the revolt of the Bulgarians and Walachians, were at this time yet more reduced by the independence of provinces[31] acquired be-

[30] Decline and Fall, &c. vol. vi. pp. 131, 134. [31] Of the coast of Anatolia the Greeks had acquired the entire circuit from Trebizond to the Syrian gates. A portion of this territory, extending from the

yond the Hellespont with the aid of the first crusaders, and of a new principality of Epirus, comprehending also Ætolia and Thessaly. The residue was divided into several portions, and only a fourth part[32] was reserved for the dominion of the emperor. The petty principality was at the same time exposed to dangers, both domestic and external. The Greeks, already alienated by religious and national antipathies, were irritated by exclusion from all civil and military honours; and the diminutive and feeble empire was surrounded by enemies eager to take advantage of its weakness, by the revolted Bulgarians and Walachians, the fugitive princes of Nice and Trebizond, and the new despot of Epirus. What was deficient in these causes of destruction, was supplied in the commercial rivalry of the Genoese and the Venetians[33], the former being easily induced to assist in the restoration of the Greeks, that they might themselves enjoy those advantages, which the latter had received from the establishment of the Latin empire.

In the division of the Turkish dominion, the independent dynasty of Roum had been established in the lesser Asia, its territory[34] extending from the Euphrates to Constantinople, and from the Black Sea to the borders of Syria. Through this formidable power did the crusaders endeavour, in their earlier expeditions, to force their way to Palestine; and it was by the experience of the difficulties, with which they struggled in their progress through the lesser Asia, that they were induced to conduct their armies afterwards by sea. So far then as the maritime character of the later expeditions was connected with the seizure of Constantinople, and the establishment of the Latin empire of that eastern capital, in the same degree must the great Turkish principality of the lesser Asia be considered as entering into the general combination of events, which constitutes the history of the crusades. The little empire

banks of the Mæander to the neighbourhood of the Greek capital, served to form the little empire of Nice.—Decline and Fall, &c. vol. vi. pp. 74, 182.

[32] The other three were equally shared between the republic of Venice and the barons of France. The doge of Venice accordingly assumed the singular title of lord of one-fourth and a half of the Roman empire, the portion of the republic being three-eighth parts, or a fourth and the half of a fourth. Ibid., pp. 177, 178.

[33] Ibid., p. 203.

[34] Ibid., vol. v. p. 675.

of Nice, formed out of a portion of the territory, which had been conquered from this principality by the first crusaders, served[35] on the other hand to shelter the imperial family of Constantinople, until it became practicable to expel their Latin conquerors.

These expeditions, when they had thus been diverted from their original object to the attack of Constantinople, were terminated in Africa. The fourth crusade had been employed in the reduction of the Greek empire; the fifth was partly, and the sixth entirely occupied, in the invasion of Egypt; and the whole series was concluded with an unsuccessful attempt to effect the conquest of Tunis.

As the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem had been overthrown by Saladin, the sultan of Egypt, it was[36] naturally concluded, that the most effectual method of prosecuting these enterprises, would be to deprive their enemy of the resources supplied by Egypt, the seat of his government. The effort, though repeated, was unsuccessful, and decided the fortune of the crusades. In the year 1218[37], twenty-five years after the death of Saladin, the crusaders attacked Damietta, and took it after a siege of sixteen months; but, the camp having been overflowed by the waters of the Nile, they were compelled to retreat, and to conclude a peace on the condition of relinquishing their conquest. Damietta was again taken in the year 1249, and the crusading army, having advanced to the same position, which had before proved fatal, was defeated in consequence of the precipitation of the van-guard, and afterwards captured, with its leader, Louis IX., of France, in attempting to effect a retreat.

The final effort of the crusaders was, in the year 1270, exhausted in the war of Tunis, which was begun by the same prince at the close of his reign, and concluded in the same year by his successor, Louis having perished by the plague. Various motives have been assigned for a direction of their forces so remote from their original object.

[35] Decline and Fall, &c., vol. vi. p. 182. [36] Sismondi has represented the French king, Louis IX., as compelled to land in Egypt, the ports of Asia being held by the viceroy of the emperor Frederic II., then under excommunication.—Hist. des Franc. tome vii. p. 356. [37] Savary's Letters on Egypt, vol. i. letter 25. Dubl. 1787.

It has been said[38], that the French monarch, who, on account of his zeal for religion, has been denominated *saint* Louis, was induced, by the hope of the conversion of the prince, to sail to that part of the coast of Africa, before he should pursue his voyage to the east. It has also been said[39], that he was persuaded to it by his brother, the king of Sicily, who was desirous that the African coast might again become tributary to the Sicilian crown, as it had been in the time of Roger the Norman. The true motive, says[40] Sismondi, was, that from Cagliari in Sardinia, where they had stopped for refreshment, they could reach Tunis in three days, whereas more than thirty would be necessary for reaching Damietta or St. John d'Acre.

In the year 1291, the crusaders were finally expelled from Asia, being then deprived of Acre, their last possession in that country. A renewal of the crusades was often meditated in succeeding times[41], but the spirit had subsided, and the season had gone by. Mickle, indeed, in his remarks on the Lusiad of Camoens, has observed, that the eastern expeditions of the Portuguese, being directed against the Saracen possessors of the oriental countries, were really a renewal of these enterprises. Louis Sforza, however, in the year 1499, inverted the principle, by forming an alliance with Bajazet, the Turkish emperor, against the Venetians, and thus introducing the Turks into the political combinations of the Christian states. The precedent was followed by Francis I. of France, who brought the Turks into Hungary to attack the emperor.

[38] Abrégé de l'Hist. de France par Daniel, tome iii. p. 146.

[39] Abrégé Chron. par Mezeray, tome iii. p. 445. [40] Hist. des Franc. tome viii. pp. 185, 186. [41] Henault has mentioned such a design, as formed in the reigns of Charles IV. and Philip VI.; and in the pontificate of Pius II., who was contemporary to Louis XI. Mezeray has noticed such a scheme in his account of the reigns of Philip VI., John I., Charles V., Charles VI., Charles VII., and Louis XI.; and has observed, that Charles VIII. proposed to pass into Greece, when he should have effected the conquest of Italy. This last project was defeated by the jealousy of the Venetians and the pope. Even in the reign, however, of Louis XII., he has remarked, the pope endeavoured to excite the Christian princes against the Turks, when they had made an irruption into Friuli, in aid of Louis Sforza. This attempt was frustrated by the disagreement of the French and Venetians.

The ultimate failure of these expeditions has been attributed by the abbé Fleury[42] chiefly to the abuse of their principle, by which their peculiar character was extended to a variety of domestic wars. The papal indulgence, which had been originally granted to those, who engaged in the war of Palestine, was first extended to the protection of the new empire of Constantinople, against the schismatics of Greece, and soon afterwards to all wars deemed necessary for the support of religion. Hostilities against not only the Saracens of Spain, but the pagans of Prussia and Livonia, the heretics of France and Germany, and even against the emperor Frederic II., and his illegitimate son Manfred, when they were at variance with the Roman pontiff, were declared to be equally meritorious with those, which were undertaken for the recovery of Palestine. The people of Christendom either availed themselves of the more convenient opportunity of procuring the remission of their sins, without engaging in a distant enterprise, or became indifferent to exhortations so far diverted from the object, which had originally excited the enthusiasm of the west. So indifferent, indeed, did the nations of Europe become to the invitations of the clergy, that it was at length found to be necessary to promise indulgences even to those, who would be present at their sermons. This abuse, however, which was a natural consequence of the influence accruing to the Roman pontiffs from the crusades, was not the sole cause of their failure. The temporal interests of their chiefs divided their forces in the very commencement; and so much was the main object, even in the first expedition, sacrificed to the desire of returning home, that Godfrey, the first king of Jerusalem, was left with an army consisting only of two thousand foot and three hundred horse. This evil became yet greater after the conquest of Constantinople, the new empire erected in Greece presenting more powerful attractions to the avidity of the western Europeans, and diverting their attention from the recovery of Palestine. Lastly, the methods of providing for the expenses of these expeditions, contributed also to abate the spirit, by which they were animated. A plenary indulgence was at first granted only to those who bore arms. It was

[42] Jortin's Remarks on Eccles. Hist. vol. iii. p. 340. Lond. 1805.

afterwards extended to those, who, being, on account of age, infirmity, or sex, incapable of service, furnished money for the maintenance of the cause; from these it was still further extended to all persons whatsoever, who gave money, either in their lives, or by their wills; and at length, even they, who had bound themselves to serve in the crusades, obtained dispensations from their vows, in consideration of pecuniary assistance. The insufficiency of these expedients gave occasion to the adoption of another, which must have alienated the whole body of the clergy, the very agents in prompting these enterprises of erroneous piety. After the loss of Jerusalem, it was deemed necessary to exact a contribution from the ecclesiastics, which, from the victorious sultan, was named the Saladin-tenth; and, so commodious a precedent of taxation was followed on all occasions, the Roman pontiffs arrogating to themselves a right of disposing of all ecclesiastical revenues.

CHAPTER XXI.

Of the consequences of the Crusades.

Condemned by Mosheim and Gibbon—Praised by Robertson—Herder held a middle opinion—Each opinion contains some truth, and they should be combined—Sale of charters occasioned by them—Feudal aristocracy depressed only in France—This accommodated to its peculiar circumstances—Greek provinces parcelled—Silk and Sugar introduced into western Europe—The Venetians driven to seek a communication with India through Egypt—Commercial communications of the Genoese—Correspondences of the crusades to the war of Troy.

A VERY superficial consideration of the crusades will produce a conviction of the importance of the consequences, which must have followed such a series of expeditions, whatever may be thought of them, as advantageous or prejudicial. Occurring just at the time, when the governments of western Europe were beginning to assume their respective forms of policy; creating a political and social intercourse among nations, which before had been scarcely brought together, except by the violences of neighbouring

hostility; familiarising the half-civilized inhabitants of the western states to the commercial opulence of the cities of Italy, to the still remaining grandeur of the eastern capital of the ancient empire, and to the peculiar manners and appearances of yet more distant countries; and exercising whatever influence of good or ill they possessed, not in one temporary and transient agency upon the society of Europe, but by an operation, continued during almost two centuries; these expeditions cannot have failed to generate effects of the greatest importance, not only in those nations of Europe, which were immediately engaged, but also as far as the influence of European manners and principles may be conceived to extend.

Historians are, however, by no means agreed in determining, whether the consequences of these enterprises should be regarded as beneficial or mischievous. Among those, by whom they have been particularly noticed, may be distinguished Mosheim, Robertson, Gibbon, and Herder. Of these four writers, Mosheim and Gibbon, influenced by very different sentiments, may yet be classed together, as agreeing in the condemnation of the crusades, which they have represented as the source of the most fatal calamities; Robertson was their unqualified panegyrist; Herder held a middle rank between the two descriptions.

Mosheim, it is obvious, regarded these enterprises, merely as an ecclesiastical historian, and, in this character, reprobating at once the corrupt principles, which had generated the fanaticism of the crusades, and the mischiefs immediately redounding to the purity of religion, from their expeditions, was naturally led to condemn the crusades, as pernicious in every view, ecclesiastical and political. The Roman pontiffs and the princes of Europe were originally, he remarks[1], engaged in them solely by superstition, though their subsequent experience of the advantages, derived from them, reinforced this principle with the impulses of ambition and avarice; and the consequences were, in his opinion, 'highly prejudicial, both to the cause of religion, and to the civil interests of mankind,' enormously augmenting the authority of the Roman pontiff, enriching the churches and monasteries, destroying ecclesiastical disci-

[1] Eccles. Hist., cent. 11, Part I. ch. i. § &8, c.

pline, aggravating the prevailing superstitions, and, on the other hand, exhausting the western nations of their population, and of their treasures.

The historian of the Roman empire, though not influenced by sentiments similar to those of the historian of the Christian church, was yet, by an opposite disposition, induced to exaggerate the abuses of Christianity, and thus for once to write in correspondence with the sincere and anxious friend of genuine religion. 'The principle of the crusades,' says this historian[2], 'was a savage fanaticism, and the most important effects were analogous to the cause. Each pilgrim was ambitious to return with his sacred spoils, the relics of Greece and Palestine; and each relic was preceded and followed by a train of miracles and visions. The belief of the catholics was corrupted by new legends, their practice by new superstitions; and the establishment of the inquisition, the mendicant orders of monks and friars, the last abuse of indulgences, and the final progress of idolatry, flowed from the baleful fountain of the holy war. The active spirit of the Latins preyed upon the vitals of their reason and religion; and, if the ninth and tenth centuries were the times of darkness, the thirteenth and fourteenth were the age of absurdity and fable.' He afterwards, indeed, admits, that society made a great and rapid progress towards improvement, during the two centuries of the crusades, but declares his opinion, that these enterprises 'checked, rather than forwarded, the maturity of Europe;' and yet concludes with acknowledging that, among the causes, which undermined the feudal aristocracy, 'a conspicuous place must be allowed to the crusades. The estates of the barons,' he observes, 'were dissipated, and their race was often extinguished, in these costly and perilous expeditions. Their poverty extorted from their pride those charters of freedom, which unlocked the fetters of the slave, secured the farm of the peasant and the shop of the artificer, and gradually restored a substance and a soul to the most numerous and useful part of the community.'

Robertson, on the contrary, has represented the consequences of the crusades as altogether beneficial[3]. Com-

[2] Decline and Fall, &c., vol. vi. pp. 209—211.

[3] Hist. of Charles V., vol. i. § 1.

posing his 'View of the Progress of Society in Europe,' and perceiving that this progress was obviously, in some respects, facilitated and incited by their operation, he appears to have contented himself with the consideration, which was favourable to his immediate purpose. He has, accordingly, described them, as having diffused information and improvement among the western nations of Europe, by leading them through Italy, Greece, and Asia, countries better cultivated and more civilised than their own, and by opening an intercourse between the east and the west, which subsisted during two centuries. He has represented them, as having produced a salutary revolution in the internal state of governments, by the opportunities afforded to sovereigns, none of whom engaged in the first of these expeditions, of purchasing, at a small expense, considerable territories from the barons; by the augmentation of the power of the monarchs, arising from the reunion of those fiefs, the possessors of which had perished, without leaving heirs to inherit them; by the facility of extending the royal prerogatives, during the absence of the feudal chiefs, who were accustomed to control and defy their superiors; and by the suspension, or extinction, of private hostilities[4], those who were engaged in these expeditions, being protected by the anathemas of the church. He has, in the last place, exhibited them, as enriching the commercial states of Italy, not only by the profits, immediately arising from conveying the armies, and supplying them with provisions, but still more by the valuable immunities, procured for those states, in the settlements, which the crusaders acquired in Asia, and by the important advantages derived to them from the conquest and temporary possession of the Greek empire.

Of the German writer a yet different account must be given. He has admitted, in a considerable degree, the advantages, which have been ascribed to the crusades, but regards these enterprises merely as concurrent causes, without which, the same effects might better have been

[4] The abbé Fleury remarks, that the crusades were more useful for this purpose, than the truce of God, both as they turned the arms of the Europeans against the infidels, and as they tended to weaken the nobility.—Discourse v.

produced. 'If,' says he[5], 'the crusades carried on by Europe in the east, may justly be considered as the epoch of a great revolution in our quarter of the globe, yet we must take care not to esteem them its first and only cause. They were nothing more than a mad enterprise, which cost Europe some millions of men, and reconveyed to it in the survivors, for the most part, a loose, daring, debauched, and ignorant rabble. The good, which was effected in their time, arose chiefly from collateral causes, which obtained freer play at this period, and produced advantages, in many respects, attended with considerable danger.' He afterwards observes[6], that 'it has been customary to ascribe so many beneficial effects to the crusades, that, conformably to this opinion, our quarter of the globe must require a similar fever, to agitate and excite its forces, once in every five or six centuries[7]; but a closer inspection will show, that most of these effects proceeded not from the crusades, at least not from them alone; and that, among the various impulses Europe then received, they were, at most, accelerating shocks, acting upon the whole in collateral or oblique directions, with which the minds of Europeans might well have dispensed. Indeed,' he adds, 'it is a mere phantom of the brain, to frame one prime source of events out of seven distinct expeditions, undertaken in a period of two centuries, by different nations, and from various motives, solely because they bore one common name.' Nor is it difficult to explain the peculiarity of the opinion of Herder, by tracing it to its source. In his Philosophy of History, his object seems to have been, to establish in politics a principle of blind fatality, agreeably to the correspondent principle in morals, which has been so generally inculcated by the dramatic writers of his country. With this view, he appears to have admitted the general progress of European society, and, at the same time, to have been disposed to depreciate the importance of contingent agencies; to have acknowledged

[5] Outlines of a Philosophy of the History of Man, p. 599.

[6] Ibid., p. 615. [7] The consequence is not fair, unless we should suppose a recurrence of similar circumstances. But it is remarkable, that the agitations of the late extraordinary crisis of the political interests of Europe, did occur at the interval mentioned by Herder.

that advantages had arisen in a crisis of so great agitation, and to have maintained, that the European machine would have worked better, without the interference of such influences.

The opinions of these eminent writers, if attentively considered, will be found to contain, each of them, much truth, amidst so great disagreement. It is true, as has been represented by Mosheim and Gibbon, that a variety of religious and ecclesiastical abuses has been occasioned, or aggravated, by these expeditions. It is true, as has been stated by Robertson, that their operation on commerce and internal policy was favourable to the general improvement of European society; and, as has been admitted by Herder, that, in producing the beneficial effects which have been ascribed to them, they acted rather as accelerating, than as distinct and indispensable causes. The statements are rather defective than untrue; and they must be combined together, for forming an adequate conception of the influences of these memorable expeditions.

The two former of these writers have omitted all consideration of the commercial benefits of the crusades; and yet they were unquestionably important to Italy, the only country of the west, which could then be considered as commercial. They have even represented them as, in this respect, of an injurious tendency, the population of the west having been greatly diminished by these enterprises, and its treasures transferred to the east. That a very considerable loss of the inhabitants of western Europe was occasioned, and a very considerable portion of its coin was drawn away, are unquestionable facts, though they do not appear to have been contemplated by Robertson, who seems to have, in this view, attended only to the advantages derived to the commercial states of Italy. Neither can it be questioned that, when a society has assumed a form, which admits the peaceable and regular exertions of domestic industry, its members may be more usefully occupied at home, than in the prosecution of a military enterprise, and that the subtraction of a large portion of its coin would be prejudicial to the public prosperity. The subject of inquiry, in the present case, is, however, not what would be the most beneficial disposition of the popu-

lation and coin of an improved society, but what would be most advantageous to a community, in which the mass of the people is oppressed by the superior orders, and industry is subjected to the most grievous restrictions, in which the nobility, disregarding the control of the sovereign, consider violence as the privilege of their inheritance, and sometimes as the instrument of their acquisitions. Such was, at that period, the state of France, the country chiefly concerned in these expeditions; and in reference to such a state of society, therefore, should the question be considered.

The judicious author of the Esprit des Croisades, has presented such a picture of the eleventh century, as must preclude every doubt, in regard to that part of the enquiry which relates to the loss of inhabitants. 'We need only,' says he[8], 'cast our eyes on the immense crowd of councils 'occasioned by the corruption of manners, and we shall see that, except the tenth century, we could scarcely find 'any so depraved as that by which it was succeeded. They 'were all occupied in condemning incestuous or adulterous 'persons, monks or clergymen, who had become vagrants, 'or soldiers, and laymen guilty of unnatural vices and of 'every species of violence; and these very councils,' he adds, 'at the same time contributed to aggravate the 'abuses, which they laboured to remove, by extending and 'multiplying the privilege of sanctuary, which was then 'attached to crosses on the highways.' It is reasonable to conclude, that[9] such a state of manners indispensably required that some great drain should be opened, for carrying away the licentiousness and the violence, which rendered society incapable of receiving the principles of improvement. That the licentious and the violent were the foremost to engage in these expeditions, is certain.

[8] Tome ii. pp. 347, 348. [9] The anecdote told of himself to the Greek emperor, by one of the crusading chiefs, is a curious instance of the barbarous ferocity of the time. 'I know but one thing,' said the haughty noble to the emperor, who had demanded who, and whence he was, 'that there is, in my country, a place near a church, to which those resort, who are desirous of signalising their valour by a duel, and where, while waiting for the appearance of an enemy, they implore the assistance of God. I have waited there often and long, and no enemy has dared to present himself before me.'—Ibid., tome iii. p. 452.

The violent were eager to embrace a method of salvation, which accorded with their ordinary practices; the licentious were well pleased to exchange their domestic situations for the irregularities of a camp. The accounts of the conduct of the crusaders in the east sufficiently prove, that their armies were principally composed of these two descriptions. When these had been swept away from the land, it was surely not less fitted for the reception of social order and happiness. The sober and industrious remained behind; and the reduction of the population of Europe must even have been serviceable to these, in bestowing upon them a larger share of political importance.

The other objection, which relates to the subtraction of the current coin of the west, may be obviated by a consideration of the connexion of currency with commerce. The more western countries, and France in particular, were indeed drained of their coin, but it was not transferred to the east. The crusaders were very far from purchasing of the orientals the necessaries, which they found in their country; and at Constantinople they were even supplied with money by the emperor. The treasures exported by the crusaders all found their way to Italy, the traders of that country contracting with the western princes for transporting their forces, and supplying from the shores of Asia the armies with provisions, after they had disembarked. The question is therefore simply, whether the sudden removal of a considerable portion of the coin of the more western countries of Europe to the commercial cities of Italy, was, at that period, prejudicial to their general interest.

For answering this question satisfactorily, it should be recollected that, though the Italian states were much more advanced in improvement than the more western countries, yet even among them the spirit of commercial activity had been but recently and imperfectly excited, and was capable of being much assisted by the stimulating application of a new and considerable capital. The other countries of the west, on the other hand, had not yet become in any degree entitled to the character of commercial communities; their traffic must have consisted chiefly in the gross productions of their soils, for the finer manufactures were unknown

among them. In such circumstances the subtraction of a considerable portion of their currency, though it must have caused much inconvenience, could not, in any great degree, have reduced their prosperity. The general improvement of western Europe may then have been promoted by this transmission of a large part of its coin from the countries still in a very rude condition, and not yet capable of engaging in the enterprises of commerce, to that which had already, though but recently, put forth the energies of industry, and was therefore qualified to receive much advantage from the introduction of a large additional capital; especially as this could ultimately repay the favour to the more western countries, by extending to them those commercial influences, which had been fostered in its own peculiarly favourable circumstances.

The historian of the Roman empire has represented the crusaders as irreclaimable barbarians, utterly insensible to the superior refinement of the nations which they visited, and incapable of deriving from an intercourse, continued during two centuries, any degree of information or improvement. It must, indeed, be acknowledged, that the crusaders were barbarians in comparison with the luxurious and corrupted inhabitants of the eastern capital; but they were not such barbarians as had, six centuries before, subverted the empire of the west. The governments of western Europe had begun to assume some degree of regularity, learning had begun to awaken among their subjects the dormant energies of mind, and the institutions of chivalry to civilise and refine the manners of society. It is not reasonable to suppose, that people, in this period of their social progress, should be insensible to a very considerable superiority of improvement, when placed directly in their view; and the passages cited by Robertson prove incontrovertibly, that the more intelligent among them regarded the elegance of the eastern capital with the most enthusiastic admiration, and were even sensible of the superiority of the Italians, not only in the refinements of life, but also in the wisdom of their political regulations. The mass of the crusaders may, indeed, have felt little of this admiration, but few of that description returned to their native countries, and the leaders must be considered as the natural vehicles for the transmission of national improvement.

But, though the historian has denied the influence of the examples of refinement, presented to the eyes of the crusaders, he has admitted that the crusaders did exercise a very extensive, though an indirect influence, in promoting the improvement of European manners, since he has represented that spirit of chivalry, to which so much of it may justly be ascribed, as an effect, not less than a cause, of these expeditions to the east. A series of distant enterprises against infidels, could not fail to cherish that mixed principle of the passion for military glory and of religious zeal, from which they had originated, and thereby augment the influence of that singular system of manners, which protected female intercourse by the barriers of decorum, and introduced the magnanimity of heroism into the conduct of ordinary life.

It should further be remarked, that both Mosheim and Gibbon have omitted the consideration of that influence of the crusades, which operated to the extinction, or the suspension, of private hostilities, the great malady of the feudal governments of Europe. If we could for a moment doubt of their importance in this respect, we must receive entire conviction from the arguments[10] alleged to have been employed by the pontiff for stimulating the chieftains of Europe to the war of the east. In such a state of society as is there described, the ordinary policy of a statesman would divert against a foreign enemy the passions of a people thus preying upon themselves; and in the case of the crusades, the domestic tranquillity of the west enjoyed the additional advantage of being guaranteed by the anathemas of Rome.

It must be remarked, on the other hand, that these two historians have noticed a consequence of the crusades, which has been omitted by Robertson, though entitled to a very serious consideration; they concur in describing the superstitions of the west as having received their last aggravations from the wars of Palestine. The reality of this consequence must be acknowledged; but, in a comprehensive view of the progress of society, it may be regarded as indirectly beneficial, however it augmented the aggregate of present evils. Tyrants have been named the fathers of freedom, and abuses may, in the same view, be considered

[10] See note 16 of the preceding chapter.

as the parents of reformation. The principle of the crusaders was indeed, as both these writers have remarked, a savage fanaticism; but the nations, in which the most unlimited indulgence was given to such a spirit, must have been hastened forwards towards reformation by the very excesses, which it instigated. The accumulation of superstitions disgusted the wise, the extreme abuse of indulgences offended the moral, and the very spirit of religious hostility, which, from foreign violences against infidels was directed to domestic violences against reputed heretics, served[11] to excite that disposition to religious reformation, which, in the sixteenth century, gave a beginning to the protestant churches of Europe.

In regard to one important consequence of the crusades all writers are agreed, except Mosheim, who does not appear to have taken it into consideration, their operation in giving a shock to the political importance of the feudal aristocracy, and in assisting the emancipation of the lower orders of society. No great sovereign was engaged in the first, or in the fourth crusade; and, except the partial and reluctant concern taken by the emperor Frederic II., the same observation may be extended to the fifth. These three of the seven principal expeditions may, accordingly, be considered, as having more especially operated to the depression of the feudal nobility, the sovereigns having remained quietly at home, while inferior princes and barons exhausted their resources, to provide for expeditions to the east. All have been regarded as having operated in favour of the lower orders, by distressing the superior classes, and reducing them to the necessity of bartering privileges for money.

The first example of the latter operation was exhibited in Italy[12], where the great augmentation of wealth, occasioned by the crusades, excited so general a desire of liberty, that, before the conclusion of the last of these expeditions, all the considerable cities of that country had either purchased, or extorted, large immunities from the emperors. These grants of municipal privileges were from Italy in-

[11] Fideles mirabantur, says M. Paris, quod tantum eis promitteret (papa, sc.) pro sanguine Christianorum effundendo, quantum pro cruore infidelium. The heretics of the south of France had protested against the principle of the original crusades.—Mosheim, cent. xi. part i. ch. i. sect. ix., note.

[12] Hist. of Charles V., vol. i. sect. i.

troduced into the other countries of Europe[13]. The sovereigns favoured the innovation, to form a counterpoise to the power of the nobles; and the nobles, impoverished by the expenses of the crusades, were eager to procure money by the sale of charters, which undermined their own importance.

Though these expeditions must have universally tended to give importance to the lower orders, the influence in depressing the feudal aristocracy, which has been ascribed to them generally by historians, appears to have been limited to France. Among the sovereigns engaged in the crusades, we find three German emperors, Conrad III., Frederic I., and Frederic II., and one king of England, Richard I.; and it has been already shown, that the expeditions of these princes were favourable to the aggrandisement of the aristocracy, in their respective countries. It has been shown[14], that the disastrous crusade, in which Conrad lost his whole army, favoured very considerably the growing power of the nobles, and that the diets acquired, in the reign of that prince, a new degree of authority; that the aristocracy of Germany was perfected in the reign of Frederic I., favoured as it was by the crusade, in which he had engaged; and that the grandeur of the imperial authority was finally ruined by the expedition, to which Frederic II. was driven by the Roman pontiff, in performance of an inconsiderate promise. Of the reign of Richard I., which was chiefly devoted to one of these enterprises, it has been remarked[15], that its bearing on the general progress of the English government appears to have consisted in exhausting the resources of the crown, in rousing the attention of the people to the exactions of the sovereign, and in favouring the independence of the nobles by his protracted absence.

In France, indeed, we perceive that three sovereigns,

[13] The practice was adopted in France by Louis the *Gross*, who died in the year 1137, and in Germany by Frederic I., who died in the year 1190. In England, it has been referred to the year 1167. The time of its commencement in Spain has not been ascertained. Incorporations, however, were introduced by the crusaders into Palestine, even before they had spread into the western countries, the franchises of burghs, or boroughs, being established by the *Assizes of Jerusalem*, a code framed at the commencement of the kingdom.

[14] Chapter xiii. [15] Chapter xvii.

Louis VII., Philip Augustus, and Louis IX., did also take the cross; but the French nobles were more generally engaged in these expeditions than the Germans and the English, and, therefore, were less able to avail themselves of the absences of their sovereigns, to diminish the royal, and to magnify their own power. In regard to Louis VII. in particular, who conducted the second crusade, in conjunction with the emperor Conrad III., it may be observed, that the general dignity of the government was maintained by the ability of his minister, the abbé Suger[16]; and that, when the enterprise had failed, and an attempt was made by the brother of the king to usurp the administration, and, perhaps, the royal authority itself, the interposition of the Roman pontiff, which certainly was not similarly exercised in Germany, preserved the public tranquillity. Of Philip Augustus, it is sufficient to remark, that he acquired the epithet added to his name, by the successful vigour, with which he recovered to the crown of France the numerous provinces of that country, connected with the government of England, for such a prince may be presumed to have been abundantly able to maintain his domestic ascendency. Louis IX. was a prince of a character so different, that he voluntarily restored to the English government many of the provinces, of which it had been deprived by Philip: but his authority was as firmly established by his moral moderation as that of Philip by his enterprising vigour; and it has been accordingly observed, that, in his reign, the ascendency of the crown was very considerably augmented[17].

These observations warrant the conclusion, that, though the crusades did generally tend to give importance to the lower orders of society, yet their operation on the relation existing between the aristocracy and the sovereign was various, and accommodated to the circumstances of each country. They depressed the nobles, and aggrandised the sovereign, in France, where the tendency of the government was towards the full establishment of the royal power; they depressed the imperial authority, and aggrandised the great members of the diets, in Germany, where the tendency of the government was towards the formation of a federative constitution; in England, they constituted

[16] Henault's Chronol. Abridgm., vol. i. p. 150. [17] Chapter vi.

one of a long and diversified series of agencies, which at length gave being to an equilibrium of the three great powers of the commonwealth.

One consequence of the crusades, overlooked by the other writers, has been noticed by Herder[18], their influence in introducing among the governments of the west a tendency towards a system of political co-operation. They may, indeed, as in the case of France and England[19], have sometimes aggravated, or engendered, the dissension of states; but a habit of co-operation, maintained during so long a period, must have exercised a considerable influence in diminishing local prejudices, and in inducing a tendency towards the formation of extensive connexions of policy. The wars of Palestine were truly the wars of the church; and, as the Romish hierarchy was the grand principle of combination among the western governments, so these expeditions may be regarded as processes, in which the influence of that principle was most powerfully exerted. The several states of western Europe were, in the crusades, united into a loose confederation, under the presidency of the Roman pontiff, the connexion of which was preserved, or renewed, by the unceasing agency of the inferior orders of the clergy.

The peculiar opinion, however, of the German writer is, that the crusades operated only as accelerating causes of effects, which must necessarily have been produced; and it seems to be just in its application to all the effects of every kind, which have been, by any of the four writers, attributed to these expeditions. The comparative improvement of the Italian republics would of itself, though but gradually, have attracted the current coin of the western states, while internal dissensions must also, though slowly, have removed their disorderly multitudes. Improvement would have been gradually, though more tardily, diffused by the communication, which must have continually increased between the western and eastern countries of Europe. The feudal aristocracy must have ultimately yielded to the ascendency of commerce, and the lower

[18] Outlines of a Philosophy of the History of Man, p. 619. [19] In the quarrel of Philip Augustus and Richard I. The rivalry of Venice and Genoa affords another remarkable example. But these were states systematically opposed in interest.

orders of society have risen to some degree of importance. The abuse of the religious and ecclesiastical system of Europe would, at length, have provoked the efforts of the moral and reflecting, and have wrought the reformation. A system of political confederation also must, at last, have been formed, among a number of neighbouring nations, already comprehended under the same ecclesiastical superintendence, and assimilated in governments and manners. Causes, fitted to produce these several effects, did actually exist among the nations of western Europe; and the crusades appear but to have furnished the exciting principle, by which they were urged into activity.

But, though this great series of enterprises should be regarded as the exciting, not as the primary cause, of the various and important changes, at this time effected in the western states, it does not follow, that they should, as Herder has represented[20], be supposed to have been extrinsic and contingent agencies, casually combined with others, which would more regularly have operated to produce the same changes. Arising from principles, which had long fermented in the western states of Europe, and being continued in successive efforts through the long period of almost two centuries, the crusades claim to be considered as the natural development of inherent causes, not as extrinsic or contingent violences, occasionally disturbing the system. These expeditions should accordingly be viewed, as constituting a great crisis of the early combinations of western Europe, the peccant principles being then thrown off, which were obstructing the improvement of the growing system, and the elements of its maturity being then excited to active energy. Such an influence may be said to be accelerating, not primary; but it was an influence arising out of the system itself, and forming a part of its constitution.

The reduction of the Greek empire, however remote from the original design and proper object of these expeditions, was yet a very natural result of the interposition of its formidable allies. A dynasty of Latin princes possessed, during fifty-seven years[21], the throne, which they

[20] Outlines of a Philosophy of the History of Man, p. 599.

[21] In this short period was comprehended a series of nine princes.

had originally undertaken to protect, while many of the European provinces of the continent[22] were granted to various chieftains of the western nations, and the islands were chiefly occupied by the Venetians[23]. It has not appeared, that the communication, thus established between the eastern and western countries of Europe, served in any degree to transmit the literary refinement, which Constantinople still possessed[24]. The western Europeans were

Of these, however, the last, except one, was a child, whose reign occupied only eight months; and the last was vanquished and taken by Saladin, when he had reigned not quite a year and a half.—Fuller's Hist. of the Holy War.

[22] The principal of these were the kingdom of Thessaly, constituted for the marquess of Montferrat, and the principality of Achaia, formed for William de Champlite, lord of Champenois.—Hist. de Venise, par Laugier, tome ii. p. 275.

[23] The Venetians purchased Candia from the marquess of Montferrat. This island had, almost three centuries before, been taken from the Saracens by the Greeks. One of the Venetian captains established himself at Naxos, which he constituted the capital of a duchy of the Archipelago. The government of Venice reserved to the state the islands at the entrance of the Adriatic, together with Candia; the rest they gave as fiefs to those who should reduce them. The Venetians did not, however, reduce all the Grecian islands, many of those, anciently named Sporades, having been secured by the subjects of the Greek emperor of Nice. They acquired moreover, besides the islands, some continental stations, a moiety of Constantinople, which they held in full sovereignty, and the towns of Modon and Caron, on the coast of the Morea, the best ports on the Ionian sea.—Ibid. pp. 275—309.

[24] So far, indeed, were the Latins of that period from respecting the literature of the Greek capital, that, in three destructive conflagrations, occasioned by their occupation of Constantinople, much of that literature perished. From the *Bibliotheca* of Photius, compiled about two centuries before, we learn, that he then possessed the History of Macedonia, by Theopompus, that of the Parthians, that of Bithynia, and that of the successors of Alexander, by Arrian; the History of Persia, and the Description of India, by Ctesias; the Geography of Agatharcides; the works of Diodorus; of Polybius, and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, complete; sixty-five orations of Demosthenes, instead of fifty-five; two hundred and thirty-three of Lysias, instead of thirty-four; sixty-four of Isæus, the instructor of Demosthenes, and fifty-two of Hyperides, instead of a single oration. Nor could these have been subsequently lost. From this time no writer has cited any of them, though the love of learning was restored with the Greek dynasty, and continued to prevail until Constantinople was taken by the Turks, at which catastrophe there was not any conflagration.—Essai sur l'Influence des Croisades, pp. 413, 414. Such losses of ancient literature appear to contradict the principle of a progressive improvement. But when we consider how

not then prepared for receiving the intellectual treasures of the eastern capital; and it was necessary, that a long interval should yet be allowed for the cultivation of vernacular literature, that it might not be overborne and suppressed by the imported learning of Greece. But such a possession of Grecian territory must have powerfully affected the western countries, in a manner better accommodated to their actual condition. That which was, at this time, required for the improvement of the west, was some strong excitement of the energies of its industry; and nothing could more effectually furnish such an excitement, than the occupation of a country, in which the arts and commerce were so much more advanced[25]. This occupa-

difficult was the struggle of the modern with the ancient languages, so that in Italy the country in which ancient literature was first restored, the dialect, which had been ennobled by Dante, actually ceased for a considerable time to be regarded as worthy of the attention of a scholar, we may perhaps conclude, that as much of the learning of antiquity has been preserved, as could be instrumental to the improvement of modern nations. Nor can it be said, that the learning, thus lost, was useless to the general progress, since only in such an abundance of the mind could the valuable products have been prepared, which have been safely transmitted. The copiousness of the intellect resembles the wild exuberance of material nature, and a large allowance is made for fruits that perish. [25] The manufacture of silk was, at this time, transferred from Greece to Sicily and Italy. It was carried, in the year 1148, to Palermo, from which it was received by Lucca; and, in the year 1314, when the latter city was pillaged, its manufacturers carried their industry to Florence, Milan, Bologna, and other cities. Into Venice it had already found its way, but that city then received an additional supply of manufacturers. No city derived from it so much prosperity as Florence. The cultivation of sugar, with which the crusaders had become acquainted, in the first crusade, when they arrived in the neighbourhood of Tripoli, in Syria, was introduced into Sicily in the same year with the manufacture of silk. From Sicily, it was carried first to Madeira, and from that island, to the Archipelago of America.—Essai sur l'Influence des Croisades, pp. 394—397. In estimating the importance of these acquisitions, they should not be considered merely as multiplying the gratifications, or even as exercising the industry of the western nations. To the silk manufacture of Florence, as has been well observed by the author last quoted, we are indebted for the brilliant and interesting age of the Medici. Who can appreciate the present and future influences of the commerce of the sugar-islands of the West Indies, extending, probably, to the reaction of their black colonisation on the continent, from which its supplies of labour have been drawn?

tion was, in truth, a system of commercial colonisation, though very different from that of a more modern period, as the circumstances of Europe were then also very different. The colonisation of the west was then established in a country of superior refinement, as its industry required to be stimulated by the example of improved activity; but it has since been planted in the wild regions of the transatlantic continent and islands, when the activity of the western nations, already exercised, required only to be presented with new objects, and opportunities of exertion. Nor was this earlier colonisation limited to the period of the Latin dynasty of Constantinople. The Genoese, by whose assistance the Greek dynasty was restored, acquired possession of Pera[26], a suburb of the capital, which gave them the command of the traffic of the Black Sea; and the Venetians retained that of the principal islands of the Archipelago, until they were forced to yield them to the ascendency of the Ottoman power.

That the continental provinces should be restored to the Greek government, appears to have been necessary for that other function of supplying to the west the refinement of literature, when it should have been prepared for the reception of the gift. Literature, which had been repressed by the rude ignorance of the Latins, began again to flourish in Constantinople, and it continued to be preserved in this last depository of the genius of antiquity, during almost two centuries[27] until the west was prepared to receive it with admiration and attention.

Towards the conclusion of these enterprises[28], a Venetian proposed a plan of operations, by which probably a very different result might have been attained. He suggested that no troops should be sent by land, but that a maritime expedition, composed of a small number of regular troops, should be employed to infest the borders of the Nile, and to form an establishment on the coast of Egypt, by which means he thought the commerce of that country might be intercepted, and destroyed, and the country itself

[26] Decline and Fall, &c., vol. vi. p. 287. [27] The Greek dynasty was re-established in the year 1261, and Constantinople was taken by the Turks in 1453. [28] Hist. des Allemands par Schmidt, tome iv. pp. 279—281.

reduced to submission. This latter event he conceived must be followed by the submission of Palestine, as the Turks could not subsist there without the supplies of Egypt.

The plan of attacking Palestine through Egypt had, indeed, been already adopted, both by the emperor Frederic II. and Louis IX. of France; but the project of the Venetian was distinguished by the proposal of forming an establishment on the coast, by that of employing regular soldiers, instead of a disorderly multitude of crusaders, and by that of maintaining a stationary fleet. Sugar and cotton, the productions of Egypt, he proposed to cultivate in Cyprus, Candia, and Sicily; and the commerce of the east he recommended to convey to Europe, through Persia and Armenia.

If such a scheme had been adopted, and had been successfully executed, its consequences would, probably, have been injurious to the improvement of Europe. No advantage could have resulted from the acquisition of Jerusalem, and the condition of Egypt, in the period following the crusades, was better accommodated to the interests of the European system, than it could have been rendered by the plan of the Venetian. As the Venetians had, by the re-establishment of the Greek dynasty, been driven from Constantinople, and deprived of the commerce of the Black Sea, which was transferred to their rivals[29] the Genoese, they[30] sought to indemnify themselves by opening a commercial intercourse with Egypt, and were thus enabled to secure to themselves the principal communication with India, and the larger portion of its valuable traffic. It happened that the trade of Egypt was, at this time, protected by the military and vigorous government of the Mamelukes[31], which was itself a result of the crusades.

[29] These formed their principal station for the trade of the Black Sea, at Caffa, in the Crimea, by which they commanded at once, the corn-trade of the Ukraine, and the sturgeon-fishery of the Don. An Indian commerce was also, though precariously, maintained by the Oxus, the Caspian Sea, the Volga, and the Don, which was met by the Italian vessels in the harbours of the Crimea.—Decline and Fall, &c., vol. vi. pp. 282, 283. [30] Robertson's Hist., Disquisition concerning India, p. 145. Lond. 1799. [31] The name, which in the Arabian language is equivalent to *slave*, has been particularly applied

The necessity of providing a supply of hardy troops to resist the efforts of the crusaders, appears to have induced the sultans of Egypt to procure the assistance of these Asiatic slaves; and they[32], immediately after the defeat of the French monarch, Louis IX., in the year 1250, assassinated their master, and placed one of themselves upon the throne, which, from that time, was occupied in succession by other slaves similarly constituted. By this government was the Venetian commerce with India protected and encouraged, until its riches excited a desire of discovering a more easy, though less direct communication, by navigating the ocean. The government too subsisted just long enough for the occasion, as it was, in the year 1517, overpowered by the Turkish emperor. If it had been overthrown, agreeably to the plan suggested for prosecuting the crusades more effectually, and if the commerce of the east had been conveyed through Persia and Armenia, in preference to Alexandria, that great extension of the Indian commerce, which excited the enterprise of modern navigators, might not have existed, and their important discoveries might have been long postponed.

In considering the crusades, our classical recollections must bring before our minds the famed war of Troy, waged by the confederated Greeks. Two important results seem to have been common to both. From the time of the Trojan war[33], the Greeks began to be more attentive to navigation, and the crusades gave, as has been stated, a powerful impulse to the commercial activity of the western countries of Europe. The war of Troy also, like the crusades, habituated a number of independent princes to act together as the members of one great confederation, connected by a common interest. These results, indeed, were much more considerable in the case of the crusades, as enterprises, which occupied two centuries, and were extended over Greece, and to Asia and Africa, must have been

to those slaves, chiefly Circassians, which were bought by the sultans of Egypt from the Tatars, to be trained to the exercise of arms.—D'Herbelot, art. *Mamlouk*. This body was suppressed, by order of the pasha, in the year 1812, their beys being massacred at a banquet, to the number of, at the lowest computation, three hundred.—Madden's Travels in Turkey, &c., vol. i. pp. 240, 242. Lond., 1829.

[32] D'Herbelot, art. *Mamlouk*. [33] Thucyd., lib. i. cap. xiii.

followed by more important consequences, than the transactions of only ten years in the vicinity of a single city. Poetry has assisted the correspondence of the two wars, by furnishing a Tasso, as the Homer of the crusades; in this respect, however, the modern is much inferior to the ancient war, for *the tinsel* of Tasso[34], inferior to the gold of Virgil, can maintain no comparison with the still purer ore of the great bard of antiquity. The heroes of Homer, indeed, were the sons of nature, and were, therefore, fit subjects for him, who, with the truth of nature, could exhibit all the workings of the human heart; but the champions of a temporary extravagance of sentiment, were better adapted to the powers of a poet, who corrupted the sublime with a frequent mixture of affected refinement, proposing Ovid[35] as the favourite standard of his imitation.

CHAPTER XXII.

Of the history of Commerce, from the suppression of the western empire in the year 476, *to the commencement of the fourteenth century.*

Commerce revived in the year 800—Venice the only city of Italy enjoying an extensive traffic to the end of the ninth century—The trade of Amalfi flourished in the tenth—Pisa and Genoa flourished in the eleventh—Woollen manufacture of the Netherlands flourishing during three centuries, from the year 960—Silver mines of Germany discovered about the year 968—Funding system commenced by Venice about the year 1175—Hanseatic league formed in the year 1241—Bills of exchange introduced by the Roman pontiff, in the year 1255.

THE ascendency of the military power of Rome had crushed the commerce of the ancient world[1], especially by the destruction of Carthage. Augustus Cæsar[2], indeed, made

[34] Boileau speaks of fools, who could prefer *le clinquant* du Tasse à tout l'or de Virgile.—Sat. ix., 176. [35] Hist. Litt. d'Italie par Ginguené, tome v. p. 426. This writer ranks the *Gerusalemme Liberata*, next after the Æneid, excluding the Paradise Lost from the class of epic poems, while he acknowledges the superior sublimity of Milton.

[1] Anderson's Hist. of Commerce, vol. i. introd. pp. i. xii Lond., 1764. [2] He established two fleets for the protection of navigation,

some exertions for its re-establishment, and, in the prosecution of a trade with India, was followed by the succeeding emperors, even until the overthrow of the western empire; but the spirit of the Roman government was military, not commercial, and the balance of wealth was supported in Italy, by the pillage of conquered nations, or by the taxes levied in the provinces, rather than by the interchange of commodities and industry.

The suppression of the western empire, ruined the renewed commerce of the west, which was almost totally interrupted from the time of that revolution, until the genius of Charlemagne, more than three centuries afterwards, laboured for its restoration. Trade was, however, still cherished in the capital of the eastern empire, which, by the peculiar advantages of its situation, was almost necessitated to be commercial, and was also sufficiently strong to defy the assaults of its barbarian enemies. Constantinople thus, while it served to secure for modern times a knowledge of the literary refinement of Greece, served also to transmit to them those relations of industrious communication, which excite the activity of man, and cultivate and improve his genius. When the cities of Italy[3] began to recover from the violences of a barbarian conquest, they opened a commerce with the ports of the Greek empire; and the trade, thus formed, was afterwards gradually extended from Italy, through the northern and western countries of Europe.

The commerce of Greece, in general, had been much enriched by the introduction of the silkworm into Europe, which was effected in the year 551[4]. The short-lived insect it was impracticable to convey from China to Greece;

one of which was stationed in the more westerly part of the Mediterranean, the other in that, which is now named the Levant. For restoring the trade with India, he again opened the communication, which had been formerly maintained with that country by the Nile, the Red Sea, and the Indian ocean.—Anderson's History of Commerce, vol. i. introd. p. xiv.

[3] Ibid.. p. vii.

[4] For the introduction of this important staple of manufacture, the people of Europe are indebted to two Persian monks, who, having been employed as missionaries in India, had penetrated into China, where they enjoyed an opportunity of witnessing the process, by which it is produced.—Robertson's Hist., Disquis. concerning India, pp. 112, 114.

but the eggs were safely carried in a hollow cane, and hatched in Europe. Vast numbers were soon reared in various parts of Greece, particularly in the Peloponnesus; the propagation was afterwards extended to Sicily, with equal success; and the example of this neighbouring island was, from time to time, imitated by several towns of Italy. The Persians, who had monopolised the trade in silk, had raised the price to an exorbitant height, while the use of it had become more general in the court of the Greek emperors; the introduction of the silkworm[5], therefore, was a very general accommodation, and much augmented the commercial industry of the Greeks, by mutiplying the supply of a material, so much esteemed.

The remaining trade of the east was, on the other hand, transferred almost wholly from Alexandria to Constantinople, in consequence of the loss of Egypt, which was conquered by the Arabs in the year 640. The Greeks were, by that event[6], excluded from intercourse with Alexandria, to which they had long resorted, as the chief mart for oriental luxuries; and, as the Arabs had previously possessed themselves of Persia, all the usual communications were, at this time, obstructed[7]. Here we have an instance

[5] The historian of the Roman empire has, on this occasion, lamented, that the art of printing had not been introduced from China, instead of the silkworm, and the manufacture of silk. If, indeed, we may suppose that the Chinese did really possess that art, it is possible, as he has remarked that the comedies of Menander, and the entire decades of Livy, might thus have been perpetuated. But the general benefit of this early introduction of the great instrument of knowledge, would soon have been intercepted in the confusion and ignorance of the middle ages, and to the silk-manufactures of the Florentines has a later period been indebted for the literary elegance of the Medici, from which Europe was then capable of receiving a durable and increasing improvement. [6] Before this event, writings of importance in Europe were executed upon the Egyptian *papyrus*, but after it, upon parchment. This, Mr. Macpherson has remarked, is, of itself, almost a sufficient proof of the exclusion.—Annals of Commerce, vol. i. p. 245. Lond. 1805. [7] Before the reduction of Palmyra, effected in the year 273, by the emperor Aurelian, Indian goods were conveyed by that city to the Mediterranean, from the Persian gulf and the Euphrates. Palmyra, with its independence, lost the spirit of industry, and sunk into that decay, in which it still exhibits the ruin of human magnificence amidst the desolation of nature. But the new Persian empire, which had been founded by Artaxerxes, in the year 230, appears to have re-

of the agency of that compressing force, which the empire of the Arabs exercised upon Europe. New communications were speedily formed, through the northern countries of Asia[8], by which Constantinople became itself a considerable emporium of Indian and Chinese commodities, and the wealth, which it received from this new and valuable traffic, not only added to its splendour, but seems to have retarded, for some time, the decline of the empire[9].

The Italians, who were nearest to this seat of the ancient commerce of the empire, had been by no means reduced to mere barbarism, having been subdued by nations which had long maintained an intercourse with the empire, and had also resided a considerable time within its limits. Some of the greater cities had even retained their ancient politeness, industry, and arts[10]. While the relics of ancient improvement thus subsisted in the country, it was by nature furnished with stations, fitted to receive, and to cherish, the animating influences, which might be communicated from the commerce of Greece.

The Venetian republic, protected by its marshes against attacks from the land, and by a great semicircular bank against invasion from the sea, afforded a secure asylum to those, who fled from the ravages of barbarians, and through the succeeding ages continued to maintain its independence, until the revolutionary war of our own time involved, in its extraordinary changes, the fortune of *the maiden city*. Nor is the commercial convenience of the situation of Venice less remarkable than its security. Communicating, on the one hand, by the Adriatic with the eastern empire, and on the other, by land with the northern

nounced that alienation from maritime enterprise, which had characterised the earlier, and to have entered largely into the trade of India. —Robertson's Hist., Disquis., sect. 2.

[8] The silk of China was conveyed, in a progress of eighty, or a hundred days, to the bank of the Oxus; thence along that river, to the Caspian Sea, across which it was transported to the river Cyrus; and from this river, by a land-carriage of five days, it was conducted to the river Phasis, by which it was borne to the Black Sea. The goods of Hindostan were carried from the bank of the Indus, either to the river Oxus, or directly to the Caspian, and from the Caspian to Constantinople, by the same course, which brought the silks of China.—Ibid., p. 124.

[9] Ibid. p. 126.

[10] Anderson's Hist. of Com., vol. i. p. 17.

and western regions of Europe, while it was immediately connected with a country, still retaining much of the improvement of the Roman government, it was eminently fitted to be the station of a most important traffic. The fugitives also, who had sought protection among its marshes, were constrained to become fishermen for subsistence, and to extend themselves over the sea, as they were cut off from the land. In forming a connexion with the eastern empire, it was moreover favoured by the vicinity of the exarchs of Ravenna, who governed for the Greek emperors the territories, which they had been able to save out of the wreck of Italy; and so strongly formed was this connexion, that it adhered to the Greek empire, when the exarchate itself had fallen under the dominion of Charlemagne.

For the establishment of Italian manufactures preparation was made in the same century, in which the formation of the Venetian republic prepared the chief instrument of the commerce of Italy; and the two operations were performed by the same cause, the irruption of the northern barbarians. Great numbers of rich and noble families retired to the city of Florence[11], not only on account of the fertility of the surrounding territory, but also because this city was, by its situation, secured from the ravages, to which almost all the other cities of Italy were then exposed. This concourse was the source of the aggrandisement, by which Florence was afterwards distinguished; and, a situation so remote from the sea being naturally unfitted for maintaining a foreign trade, the industry of its inhabitants was necessarily directed to manufactures[12].

It seems to be the general law of human activity, that it must be maintained by the opposition of a rival power. The commercial enterprise of Italy was accordingly not confined to Venice, but the other coast of the peninsula was furnished with an apparatus of maritime stations, the function of which consisted in attracting a portion of the commerce of Greece, and conducting it to the aggrandisement of Genoa, the maritime rival of the great state of the Adriatic. The southern extremity of Italy might

[11] Anderson's Hist. of Com., vol. i. p. 21. [12] Robertson's Hist., Disquis., p. 147.

naturally be supposed to have been particularly adapted to the commencement of a commerce with the Greek empire, especially as the Greeks long kept possession of the southern provinces of the peninsula. Amalfi thus, in an early period, became a considerable emporium of the Greek trade. But, as the situation of this port, however convenient for a communication with Greece, was less commodious than that of Venice, for maintaining a commercial intercourse with the northern and western countries of Europe, so is it observable that, like Genoa, but even in a much greater degree, was it subjected to the local disadvantages of being excluded from the neighbouring country by a range of very difficult mountains[13]. Amalfi, accordingly, became a mere port, which served to attract a portion of valuable traffic, and preserve it for Pisa and Genoa, while Venice, which was so much better situated for extending the benefits of commerce over the other countries of Europe, became the great and permanent station of the trade of Italy. That republic, indeed, with Capua and Naples, might have continued to flourish, if it had not been exposed to the assaults of the new dominion established by the Normans in the south of Italy. This power it was, which crushed the prosperity of these more exposed communities, and propelled commerce and industry further towards the west.

The commercial communication with the Greek empire was the principal channel, for conveying the commodities of the east to western Europe, in the interval between the loss of Egypt and the commencement of the ninth century, or during one hundred and sixty years. The increasing taste for these luxuries on the one hand, and the obvious interest of the caliphs and their subjects on the other, did afterwards, however, again open the more convenient communication by the ports of Egypt and Syria. This communication was interrupted by the crusades, which commenced towards the conclusion of the eleventh century; but it was once more opened by the Venetians, when, after the subversion of the Latin empire of Constantinople, they found themselves supplanted in that city by their rivals the Genoese.

[13] Mitford's History of Greece, vol. vi. p. 392, *note.*

Though it appears, that the commerce of Italy had not been wholly destroyed by the irruptions of the northern nations, and that these very irruptions, on the contrary, produced effects tending to restore its languishing industry, yet so unfavourable was the military government of the Goths and Lombards, who successively possessed themselves of the country, that the historian of commerce [14] has dated the beginning of its revival only from the year 800, in which the illustrious Charlemagne, who had, twenty-six years before, overthrown the kingdom of the latter people, was acknowledged as the western emperor. About that time this prince rebuilt many decayed cities of Italy, in particular Genoa, which afterwards became the commercial rival of Venice, and Florence, which became the most distinguished seat of the manufactures of Italy. The violences too, which he employed for establishing the Christian religion in his German conquests, or rather for subduing by the Christian religion the ferocity of the barbarous inhabitants, were conducive to the diffusion of commerce through the northern countries of Europe, not only by introducing into those countries the habits of a more improved society, but also by opening a regular and frequent communication with the countries of the south. The connexion, which Charlemagne formed with the eastern caliph, must yet more directly have encouraged the commerce of the west, by facilitating the opening of communications, which had been obstructed by the hostility of the Arabs.

For fostering the commercial industry, which was afterwards extended through the northern and western regions of Europe, Italy was especially qualified by its political arrangements. The connexion of commercial prosperity with the principles of free and equal government, is obvious in theory, and abundantly confirmed by historical examples; and Italy appears to have been prepared, by an extraordinary combination of various causes, acting from the very commencement of its modern history, to become the scene of a multiplied system of republican independence.

The feudal government, as it was established by the

[14] Anderson, vol. i. p. 33.

Lombards, tended naturally to a distribution of the country into a multitude of petty states. Not like the vassalage, introduced afterwards in France by Charles Martel, which was essentially a dependence on a military leader, that of the Lombards was the haughty stipulation of a proud nobility, which must terminate in an actual separation of interests, as soon as the control of the sovereign power should have been withdrawn. The removal of this control was begun by the successes of Charlemagne, the sovereignty of northern Italy having been thereby transferred to a foreign monarch, whose domestic engagements did not permit him to exercise a very vigilant supremacy over his Italian territory. It was carried further by the change, which followed the death of the fourth emperor of the west, Louis II., at which time, this prince having left no children, the imperial dignity, and with it the crown of Italy, became plainly elective, and the Italian aristocracy acquired that increase of importance, which such a form of government must bestow on the electors. When that aristocracy had done its work, in generating a distinctness of political interests, and a multiplied division of territory, it was gradually enfeebled by the action of the causes, which have been specified in the eighth chapter, and thus was at length removed out of the way an order of men, which had prepared the distinctness of the Italian republics, but would have obstructed the formation of the municipal governments, in which alone their commerce could attain to prosperity. The establishment of Italian independence was finally favoured by the great struggle between the Roman pontiff and the German emperor, which paralysed the remaining power of the sovereign of northern Italy, and permitted the cities of Lombardy to assert, at the peace of Constance, concluded in the year 1183, their almost perfect liberty.

To the end of the ninth century[15], Venice was the only city of Italy, which enjoyed an extensive traffic; and it was, accordingly, the magazine of all the countries adjacent to the Adriatic. The trade of Amalfi flourished only in the tenth century. The people of Pisa and Genoa, who afterwards became the rivals of the Venetians them-

[15] Revol. d'Italie, tome ii. p. 448.

selves, were not distinguished before the eleventh. Amalfi served merely, as has been already remarked, to attract to the south-western coast of Italy, a portion of the Greek commerce, which it speedily transmitted to the other sea-ports on the same coast, Pisa and Genoa. Pisa presents itself to us in a two-fold character; as the trading station, which excited and disciplined the commercial activity of Genoa, and as the port, which afforded an issue for the manufacturing industry of Florence. In either view the commercial prosperity of its people would have been unavailing in an earlier period. Genoa, likewise, discharged a double function. It was primarily the competitor of Venice for the dominion of the sea, and secondarily it served to transmit to the southern provinces of France the spirit of commercial enterprise, which had been successively communicated through Amalfi and Pisa. In neither respect, however, could its aggrandisement have been sooner useful, as the crusades, which began near the close of the eleventh century, furnished the occasion of the mighty struggle between the two great maritime powers of Italy, and the southern provinces of the neighbouring country, could not have been well prepared for receiving the advantages, which it derived from the extreme agitations of Genoa, until those memorable expeditions had directed to the sea the exertions of their people.

The diffusion of commerce throughout Europe has been powerfully assisted by the conjoint influences of the two dispensations of religion, which divine revelation has, in different periods, given to the world. The great resort of the clergy to Rome[16], did not a little contribute to open that correspondence throughout the west, by which the traders of Italy were enabled to disperse, every where, the rich merchandise of Greece and the Levant, and in this manner did the conquests of Charlemagne in Germany, and the later successes of the Teutonic knights in Livonia and Prussia, promote the commerce of those countries, by giving occasion to the introduction of a Christian clergy. On the other hand[17], the proscribed condition of the Jews

[16] Anderson, introd. p. vii. [17] Basnage has given a summary of the decrees of councils and the edicts of princes, issued against the Jews in all ages of the Christian church. They prohibited inter-

had the inevitable operation, of rendering them the active agents in managing the commercial intercourse of Europe. Having no country properly their own, and being every where encountered by the antipathy of the Christians, they naturally applied themselves to the occupations of trade, more especially as the Christian nations generally debarred them from the hereditary possession of lands, and from the privileges of handicraft corporations in towns and cities. Thus the ecclesiastical establishment of the one religion introduced a frequent intercourse between the region of commerce and of comparative refinement, and the poorer and less improved countries of Europe; and the persecuted state of the other, supplied a description of persons, who were eager to avail themselves of every opportunity of converting that intercourse into a commercial connexion.

The Christians, through an erroneous construction of a scriptural injunction, favoured, in one important particular, the commercial dealings of the Jews. The latter[18] had been commanded not to lend money at interest among themselves, though they were permitted to accept such a profit from strangers[19]; and the Christians, not considering that, like the institution of the jubilee, this prohibition also had reference to the preservation of political distribution of the Jewish people, adopted it as a commandment

marriages between Christians and Jews, and even the ordinary intercourses of society; they forbade the latter to have Christian slaves, or to be employed as physicians by Christians; they deprived them of dignities, offices, and honours; they even endeavoured to exclude them from the trade of money, but here they were defeated by the mutual interest of the parties; they frequently forced from them their children, to educate them as Christians; and they compelled them to wear some peculiar badge, by which they should be distinguished as a degraded people. To justify some of these severities, various enormities were alleged against them. But Basnage has remarked, that these accusations were not urged against them until the thirteenth century, though, in the earlier ages, their jealousy of Christianity might be supposed to have been more vehement; that they were always followed by tumultuary violences of the Christians, which discredit the imputations; and that the narratives were blended with accounts of legendary miracles, which increase the suspicion.—Hist. of the Jews, book vii. ch. xi., xii., xiii. Lond., 1708.

[18] Exodus xxii. 25. Levit. xxv. 36. Deut. xxiii. 19. [19] Deut. xxviii. 20.

of perpetual obligation. By the council of Nice[20], accordingly, the clergy were forbidden to receive interest for money, under the penalty of degradation, and by Charlemagne[21], the prohibition was extended to the laity. The regulation of Charlemagne was adopted in England, under the government of Edward *the confessor*, who had probably received it from his neighbours of Normandy. By this erroneous interpretation, the Christians were induced to abandon a profitable species of traffic wholly to the Jews, who were thus encouraged to become dealers in money, while they were excluded from almost every other lucrative occupation[22].

Confined, as the Jews have generally been, to mercantile pursuits, the occasional persecutions, which they have suffered, have been beneficial to the modern system of Europe, by sending them into places, in which they might be more serviceable to commerce, and by hindering them from engrossing, in these places, the commercial capital. The Jews, who had remained in Persia from the time of the Babylonish captivity[23], probably reinforced, after the destruction of Jerusalem, by many of the descendants of the two tribes, which had returned with Ezra, created a prince of the captivity, who resided in Babylon, and regu-

[20] Canon xviii. [21] Anderson, vol. i. p. 59. [22] Notwithstanding the prohibition mentioned in note 17, they continued to be employed as physicians, until the improvement of medical learning among the Christians had given the latter a superiority. The medical reputation of the Jews had, probably, been derived from their intercourse with the Arabs of Spain, in which country they were very numerous. [23] Basnage has concluded, book vi. ch. ii. sec. iii., that the greater part of the strangers, mentioned as appearing at Jerusalem on the feast of Pentecost, when the apostles began to preach there after the ascension of Jesus Christ, were not proselytes, but Jews of the dispersion. If this be so, which seems the more reasonable opinion, the great success of the apostle Peter, in preaching to this assemblage, appears to indicate, that the separation of the ten tribes had prepared, in various countries, a description of persons, who were most accessible to the arguments of these inspired teachers, as they were acquainted with the prophecies of the ancient scriptures, and, at the same time, estranged from the pride of temporal dominion. The opinion of Basnage receives confirmation from the following passage, quoted by Beausobre from Asseman: Christiani in Elymaitică, Susianâ, Chusianâ, et Huzitide, ab initio frequentissimi fuerunt.—Hist. de Manichee, tome i. p. 160. Amst., 1734.

lated the domestic concerns of the Jews of the Persian empire, while a patriarch, established at Tiberias, was regarded as the head of those of the western countries. Under this superintendence, the Jews of the east enjoyed a degree of prosperity until the year 1039[24]; but in that year a violent persecution by the sultan destroyed the prince of the captivity, shut up the Jewish academies[25], and drove the professors, with the greater part of the people, into the west. Another persecution[26], which they suffered at the end of the twelfth or thirteenth century, completed the ruin of this part of the nation. When the Jews of Europe had been thus, in the very period of reviving commerce, reinforced by the accession of so many of those of the east, they must have become possessed of too great importance in the general system, if their prosperity had not been repressed by some strong spirit of hostility; this, however, was supplied by the crusades, the champions[27] of those expeditions directing against them, whose ancestors had crucified the Redeemer of

[24] Basnage, book vii. ch. iv. [25] The most ancient of these was established at Nabardea, on the bank of the Euphrates, said to have been founded in the year 220 or 230, and was ruined by the capture of that town in the year 278. Two others were founded in the same century; two more about the middle of the fourth; and one, at the end of the tenth, said to have been attended by ten thousand Jews. These academies seem, however, to have been employed almost solely in teaching the absurdities of the *talmuds* and the *cabbala*. The *misnah*, or collection of traditions, had been completed towards the end of the second century. This work being both confused and defective, it was found necessary to compose a commentary or *talmud;* and accordingly, in the following century, one was framed in Judea, and another at Babylon. The latter of these, which is preferred to the other, is said to have been completed in the year 500 . 505. This collection, which contains a multitude of things most offensive to common sense, is preferred by the Jews to the sacred writings. The *cabbala*, which is the mystical science of Judaism, was first committed to writing by Simeon Jochaides, who lived some years after the destruction of Jerusalem.—Basnage, book iii. ch. iv., v., vi., x. When these academies had been prohibited, and many of the Jews were driven into the west, they learned, both from the Arabs and from the Christians, to admire the philosophy of Aristotle, and from the twelfth century, they became distinguished for the knowledge of the mathematical and the physical sciences. The most celebrated of these learned Jews were, Aben Esra and Maimonides, both Spaniards.—Brucker, per. ii. part i. lib. ii. cap. ii. § § xv., xvi. [26] Basnage, book vii. ch. xiv. § ii. [27] Ibid., § xv.

mankind, the same animosity, by which they were actuated against the infidels, who had possessed themselves of the scene of his ministry and sufferings. But though, in the various countries of Europe, the people were often hostile to the Jews, they frequently experienced protection from the princes[28], who were sensible of the benefits received from the services of these agents; and the court of Rome, in particular, has been noted for extending to them a toleration, which it did not grant to the heretics of the Christian profession.

The crusades, which excited this hostility against the Jews, served at the same time to awaken the commercial enterprise of the Christians of the west. Indeed, the pilgrimages performed to Jerusalem[29], which had been in the eighth century substituted for the canonical penances, and were greatly multiplied in the tenth and eleventh, were often connected with commercial speculations[30]. Robertson has remarked, on the authority of William of Tyre, that many of the pilgrims, by exchanging the productions of Europe for the more valuable commodities of Asia, particularly those of India, diffused at that time through every part of the dominions of the caliph, both enriched themselves, and procured for their countrymen such a supply of eastern luxuries, as increased the desire of possessing them, and disposed the Europeans to exert their best efforts for extending a traffic so gratifying. When these pacific journeys had terminated in the hostile expeditions of the crusaders, the number of those, who enjoyed the opportunity of witnessing and participating the refinements of oriental luxury, was greatly augmented; the occupation of transporting the armaments of western Europe, and of furnishing them with the necessary supplies, excited the activity of the maritime cities of Italy; the temporary possession of the Greek empire transferred to the crusaders, the emporium of the

[28] Basnage, book vii. ch. xvii.—xxi. [29] Robertson's Hist., Disquis., p. 134. [30] This was probably the cause, for which they were tolerated, and even encouraged, by the Arabs, who allowed a fair to be annually held in Jerusalem, on the fifteenth day of September. The trade, thus managed at Jerusalem, was probably, in a great measure, carried on for the purchase of eastern goods, which were brought thither by Bassora, the Euphrates, and caravans.—Macpherson, vol. i. p. 241.

eastern commerce; and the subsequent loss of that acquisition, in the rivalry of Venice and Genoa, gave occasion to an extension of commercial enterprise, by which the former and more commodious channel of that commerce was again opened. These expeditions in this manner formed a grand and interesting epoch of the trade and manufactures, not less than of the manners, the political interests, and the religion of western Europe. Two of the commercial gifts, which we have received from them, continue to this day; the introduction of silk added to the objects of our domestic industry, and that of sugar supplied the great inducement to the commerce of the western archipelago.

The historian of commerce has justly mentioned[31], as favouring the restoration of that of Europe, the revival of the credit and authority of the civil, or Roman law. The feudal law was, in its time, conducive to the improvement of Europe, by maintaining a spirit of political independence, and that distribution of the orders of society, which was necessary to the construction of mixed and balanced governments; but its principles, belonging to a military community, were unfriendly to industry and commerce. In the system of Europe, however, two heterogeneous ingredients were combined, a military aristocracy and the industry of towns. In the earlier period of modern history, the former predominated, and the industry of towns was in a very low condition; but industry by degrees prevailed against the disdain and oppression of a haughty nobility, an estate of the commons was constituted in every feudal government, and the privileges of the aristocracy were either overthrown, or controlled, by the franchises of citizens. When the composition of European society was undergoing a change so favourable to the industrious portion of each community, it was natural that the venerable code of Roman jurisprudence, neglected and almost forgotten amidst the struggles of the feudal period, should be gradually restored to authority; and this in its turn, as it contained all the principles of the most refined equity, and many curious regulations of the concerns of traders, must have powerfully assisted and encouraged that spirit of commerce, to which it was indebted for its re-establishment.

[31] Anderson, vol. i. p. 79.

The maritime law, indeed, of the ancient empire was subjected to modifications, accommodated to the altered circumstances of Europe. The law of Rhodes had been of the highest reputation, during the continuance of the Roman dominion, and by the emperor Antoninus was formally ordained to be the code of navigation[32]. A new code was introduced by the people of Amalfi, whose commercial prosperity was, as has been remarked, comprehended within the tenth century. Another system, named the laws of Oleron, is said to have been promulgated in that island by Richard I. of England, in the year 1194[33], when he was returning from Palestine. The merchants of Wisburgh on the Baltic, in a somewhat later period, formed a new code, which was almost universally received in the north of Europe[34]. About the middle of the thirteenth century, the people of Barcelona framed another[35], which was formally adopted in the year 1255 by the Venetians, then established at Constantinople, and, under the name of *Consolata del Mar*, was observed by the other trading states of Italy, and became the fundamental law of the commerce of the Mediterranean. It deserves attention, that the last-mentioned code contains, distinctly stated, the very same principles of maritime law, for which the British government has recently contended with America and with France[36].

The first step, in the progress of manufacturing industry

[32] 'I, the master of the world,' says the emperor, in this edict; 'let everything relative to naval affairs be determined by the maritime code of the Rhodians, as often as that shall not directly contradict our laws.'—Volusius Maximus de Lege Rhodiacâ quoted in Savary's Letters on Greece, pp. 72, 73. Dubl., 1788.

[33] None, however, of the many writers, who have had occasion to mention these laws, have been able to find any contemporary authority, or even any ancient satisfactory warrant, for affixing to them the name of this prince. They consist of forty-seven short regulations for average, salvage, wreck, &c., copied from the ancient laws of Rhodes, or perhaps, more immediately, from those of Barcelona.—Ibid., p. 358.

[34] Anderson, vol. i. p. 96. [35] Essai sur l'Influence des Croisades, p. 375. [36] The two hundred and seventy-third chapter contains the following regulations:—1. An enemy's cargo, in the ship of an enemy, are both good prize; 2. A neutral cargo, in the ship of an enemy, is subject to ransom; 3. An enemy's cargo, in a neutral ship, is good prize, and ought to be delivered by the neutral vessel in some secure port, for the captor.—Essai sur l'Influence des Croisades, p. 376.

from the towns of Italy, was to those of the Netherlands. The woollen manufacture, which had been before established in Flanders, was, in the year 960, considerably improved by the institution of yearly fairs in several places, and by an exemption from all tolls or duties[37]. That this should have been the first country of the west, into which any considerable spirit of manufacturing industry was introduced, has been ascribed, by the pensionary De Witt, to the proximity of France, the inhabitants of that fruitful land being enabled, by its superfluous produce, to purchase for themselves the good apparel, which was wrought by the industrious Flemings. The manufacture continued to improve, during three centuries[38], until it was injured by the regulations of the halls, introduced under the pretence of preventing frauds, but really to confine to the cities the industry of the Flemish workmen. These regulations, contrary to the design of those who had planned them, drove the manufacture into the villages, where, in the contests with France, it was exposed to the violences of war. The unwise policy of the Flemings had, however, the useful effect of extending it, as from their villages it was driven, by the hostilities of the French, into Brabant. The Brabanters again acting with as little wisdom, it was among them so disturbed by tumults, that it was carried by fugitive artisans into Holland and England.

The discovery of the silver-mines of Germany, which was made about the year 968, afforded a seasonable supply of a circulating medium for the industry of the north. So great had been the scarcity of money in these countries, that their exchanges had been effected by barter, not by purchase[39]. Their rising trade must, therefore, have been very powerfully assisted by a discovery, which so critically furnished a convenient medium of commerce. In process

[37] De Witt's True Interest and Polit. Maxims of the Repub. of Holland, part i. chap. xi. Lond. 1746. [38] Flanders was so enriched by commerce, towards the end of this period, that, when John king of England, and his allies, were planning the conquest and partition of France, it was agreed, that the title of king of France should be given to the earl of Flanders, because he had contributed the greatest proportion of men, and had supported the whole army with his gold.—Macpherson, vol. i. p. 404. [39] De Witt, part i. chap. xi.

of time, indeed, the supply appears to have been rendered, by the discovery of several new mines[40], inconveniently abundant. In the fifteenth century, the prices of merchandise of every kind had been so much increased in Germany, by that depreciation of money, which is the natural consequence of a great augmentation of its quantity, that much embarrassment was occasioned, and the decline of commerce became a subject of general complaint. Commerce was, however, in general more flourishing than ever; and we know that the extraordinary supply of silver was soon afterwards absorbed in the great extension of the Indian trade, which was the result of the discoveries of the Portuguese.

The woollen manufacture of the Netherlands created a demand for wool, which was accordingly the staple commodity of England during the whole of this period, and ultimately introduced into it the manufacture of that substance, the first of those fabrics, which have so essentially contributed to the improvement and aggrandisement of the British empire. When the export of wool had thus formed a considerable addition to the older exports of leather[41], tin, lead, and corn, England was enabled, not only to procure a supply of foreign commodities, but even to accumulate a capital, which was afterwards employed in creating domestic manufactures. During this period, however, the trade of England was managed principally by German and Italian merchants[42]; nor can that commerce, which

[40] Schmidt, tome v. pp. 515, 516. The tenth, we are informed, of the mines of Misnia, within thirty years from the discovery, amounted to 324,937 quintals of silver, or 5199 tons of gold; and we are further told, that duke Albert dined there on a block of silver, which produced 400 quintals. [41] Anderson, vol. i. p. 135. We are informed by Schmidt (tome iv. p. 22), that, in the year 1241, mines of tin were discovered in Bohemia, after which time, he adds, on the authority of M. Paris (p. m. 552), the Germans carried a quantity of that metal into England. But Mr. Macpherson remarks, that English tin is of superior quality, its marks being counterfeited. Vol. i. p. 393. [42] Henry, vol. viii. p. 332. The foreign merchants were formed into companies, some of which were a kind of corporations. The most ancient and considerable of these companies was that of the German merchants of the steel-yard, which had been settled in England even before the conquest, but afterwards became much more opulent, by its connexion with the hanseatic league. The company of the merchants of the staple was formed in the beginning of the reign of Henry III. The companies of the Italians seem to

was properly English, any more than the manufacturing industry of England, claim any considerable commencement, prior to the reign of Edward III.

From this account of the progress of commerce, from Italy to the Netherlands, it must not be inferred, that France was, during this period, destitute of commercial industry. Even in the time of Charlemagne, there were various manufactures of wool, iron, and glass, in the southern cities of that country[43], and the merchants of Marseilles maintained a trade with Alexandria. In the time of the crusades, indeed, the habits of commercial industry had given a character so peculiar to the people of the southern provinces, that the people of Provence in particular were proverbially contrasted with their northern countrymen, as attentive only to gain, while the others were devoted to arms[44]. But, though the ancient commerce of the southern provinces, and the vicinity of Italy and Spain, would not suffer them to be destitute of commerce and manufactures, they were not the scene of any extraordinary degree of commercial prosperity, as they were not in the route, by which the commerce of Italy was diffused through the west. Peculiar circumstances directed that trade to the Netherlands, these provinces, with little superfluity of their own produce, being con-

have been rather private partnerships, and were very numerous. That there were, in the year 1258, some English merchants, appears, as Anderson has observed (vol. i. p. 106), from the provisions of Oxford, by which it was determined, that foreign merchants should be detained in the beginning of a war, until it should have been ascertained, that those of England were safe in the country, against which it was declared. The first commercial society of English merchants, he states (p. 117), was that of Saint Thomas Becket, the beginning of which, he says, some authors refer to the year 1248. This writer conceives, that the society of Saint Thomas Becket gave rise to that of the merchants of the staple, which must therefore have been of later origin, than it has been represented by Henry. According to this account, the attempt to form a society of English merchants proved abortive, for those of the staple originally were all foreigners. A statute of Edward III., in the year 1353, prohibited English merchants from carrying staple commodities out of the realm; but by another statute of the same king, in the year 1362, the same liberty was given to them, as to foreigners.

[43] Anderson, vol. i. p. 38.

[44] *Franci ad bella, Provinciales ad victualia,* was repeated even by children.—Esprit des Croisades, tome iv. p. 433.

tiguous to the more fertile country of France on the one part, and adjacent, on the other, to the example of Italian industry, while the proximity of England furnished an abundant supply of the material, on which it was chiefly employed[45].

England had enjoyed some portion of commerce from a yet earlier period. London[46] is described as having been, in the beginning of the seventh century, an emporium of various nations, which resorted thither by sea and land, a description however implying a passive traffic. The trade of England[47] must afterwards have been improved by the establishment of the Danes, as, in the reign of Canute, its people were subject to the same sovereign with all the trading people of the north of Europe, and secured from the attacks of pirates by the power of so considerable a prince. In the charter indeed of Henry I., no mention of commerce occurs, and it had, probably, been much reduced during the violences of the feudal government; but under Henry II., all the French ports of the ocean, except Boulogne and Calais, becoming connected with the crown of England, it began to recover from its temporary depression, and, though burgesses[48] were still held in contempt, it was, however, judged expedient to extend protection to merchants, by a particular provision of the great charter. A considerable number of Flemings[49], driven from their own country by an encroachment of the sea, came to England in the time of William the Conqueror, hoping to receive protection from his queen, who was of their country. These foreigners were in the year 1111, collected by Henry I., and placed in a district of Pembrokeshire,

[45] How much English wool was then considered as superior to that of Spain, appears from the injunction issued by Henry II., in the thirty-first year of his reign, that cloth, in which Spanish wool had been mixed with English, should be burned. — Macpherson, vol. i. p. 347. It is said, that the fine wool of Spain has been produced by a breed of sheep, derived from some allowed to be transported thither in the year 1464, from the Cotswold hills of Gloucestershire. [46] Anderson, vol. i. p. 24. [47] Macpherson, vol. i. p. 289. [48] In the parliament held at Merton, it was enacted, that a superior lord, who should disparage his ward, being under fourteen years of age, by marrying her to a villein or a burgess, should forfeit the wardship of the lands.—Ibid., vol. i. p. 389.

[49] Ibid., p. 316.

named Ros, which had been taken from the Welsh, that prince having observed that they did not live in harmony with his English subjects; and this establishment gave the true, though but a feeble beginning, to the finer manufacture of woollen cloth. Cloth of Ireland is also mentioned[50], as having been stolen at Winchester, some time in the reign of Henry III.

The third and last step in the progress of the commerce of Europe, within the period contemplated in this chapter, was the formation of the grand confederacy of the hanse-towns, or associated cities of Germany. The peculiar government of this country, the members of which had become almost independent, and were connected rather by a law of nations, than by a political union, was naturally fitted for receiving and maturing that spirit of commerce, which had been nurtured in the little republics of Italy, and communicated to the cities of the Netherlands. Both the policy of the sovereign, and the disorderly violence of the nobles, co-operated with this peculiar arrangement of the government, to aggrandise the commerce of Germany. The emperors found it necessary to give protection to the cities, that they might obtain their support against the encroachments of an overbearing aristocracy; and amidst the general anarchy, occasioned by the reduction of the imperial authority[51], the cities were at once excited and enabled to associate for their common security.

The commercial cities of the Rhine first adopted the scheme of a confederation. This earlier effort was repressed by the power of the nobility; but, more favourable circumstances soon afterwards occurring, the example was eagerly imitated, and in the year 1241 was formed the hanseatic league, composed of the most flourishing cities of Germany. The formation of this league may be considered as having completed the history of the merely interior commerce of Europe, since it subsisted in prosperity and power until the discovery of the route to India, by the Cape of Good Hope, began the period of a distant navigation and extended traffic. Connecting the commerce of Italy with that of the Baltic[52], and thereby providing for

[50] Madox's Hist. of the Exchequer, vol i. p. 550. [51] Schmidt, tome v. p. 510. [52] This connexion was formed through the south-

the interchange of all the variety of commodities, with which the several nations of Europe could supply their reciprocal wants, it fulfilled what appears to have been one of the functions of the German government[53], that of extending throughout Europe the industry of the Italian traders.

How intimately the league of the hanse-towns was connected with Italian commerce, appears from the observation of a German historian[54], that the decline of its prosperity was consequent on that of Venice, when this great emporium had suffered by the memorable discovery of the new route to the east. It formed, indeed, with that emporium, an amicable confederation of general industry, for, the voyage[55] and return between the Baltic and the Mediterranean being, in the imperfect state of navigation, too great an enterprise for a single summer, it became necessary to employ some one of the ports of Flanders, particularly Bruges, as an intermediate station, and thus to share with the merchants of that country, the benefits of trade.

In this review of the first period of the commerce of modern Europe, it should not be omitted, that Iceland[56], which had been accidentally discovered in the year 861, and had been colonised in the year 878, maintained during several centuries a considerable carrying-trade in the northern seas, the ships of that settlement visiting Britain, Ireland, the adjacent islands, France, Germany, and all the northern countries of Europe; that to the year 978[57], belongs the earliest undoubted account of a herring-fishery, which was on the coast of Norway; that to the reign of David I. of Scotland[58], contemporary to Henry I. and Stephen of England, belongs the first authentic notice of such a fishery on the coast of Britain; and that the Dutch[59] refer the commencement of their own to a time somewhat later, supposing it to have been begun about the year 1165. Nor should it be forgotten that coal, which,

ern cities, particularly Augsburg and Nuremberg, which had a trading establishment at Venice.—Schmidt, tome v. p. 513. [53] Quod si verum est, quod aiunt, ibi opes esse, ubi negotiatores, fatearis necesse est opulentissimos esse Germanos, quorum pars maxima, lucris inhians, mercaturis intenta, alienas longe lateque provincias perva gatur,—ac non nisi dives domum revertitur.—Æneas Sylv., l. c. p. 697.—Ibid., p. 514. [54] Schmidt, tome v. p. 519. [55] Anderson, vol. i. p. 121. [56] Macpherson, vol. i. pp. 260, 261. [57] Ibid., p. 274. [58] Ibid., p. 325. [59] Ibid., p. 337.

since the invention of the steam-engine, has proved so powerful an agent of industry and navigation, was brought to London[60] from Newcastle, at least as early as the year 1245.

Though since the invasion of the Arabs, the Christians of Spain were chiefly occupied in the great struggle with that people, yet in those parts of the peninsula, which were free from the dominion of the infidels, they gave attention to the pursuits of commerce. Towards the close of the tenth century[61], the people of Biscay began to employ themselves in manufacturing their excellent iron, not only for their own use, but also for the supply of other nations; the port of Bilboa also began to have shipping, and to maintain a considerable foreign trade. On the Mediterranean coast, Barcelona, which had been the principal station[62] of the intercourse of the Arabs of Spain with the countries of the Levant, continued, under its Christian government, to enjoy a considerable commerce[63], and became distinguished by the wisdom of its maritime regulations[64]. The woollen manufacture too of Catalonia[65], which appears to have been well established before the year 1243, continued to flourish in Barcelona, and many other towns of the province, until the union of the kingdom of Aragon with that of Castile, impaired the prosperity of the former of these countries, and other causes, affecting the general government, destroyed the industry of Spain. The Arabs, at once the mathematicians and the chemists of this early period, assisted the commerce of the Christians, by communicating to them two most important discoveries, the decimal notation of arithmetic, which they had brought from the east, and the art of distillation, which they had learned from the Egyptians. By the former of these communications they facilitated the calculations of merchants, and by the latter they encouraged agriculture[66], and multiplied the objects of commerce. The decimal notation[67]

[60] Macpherson, vol. i. p. 395. [61] Anderson, vol. i. pp. 53, 143.
[62] Macpherson, vol. i. p. 299. [63] Ibid., p. 386. [64] Among these it is to be remarked, that the Catalans, in the year 1227, framed the first navigation-act.—Ibid., p. 386. [65] Ibid., p. 416.
[66] Mr. Malthus has remarked, that distilleries are the best granaries, by providing an extraordinary supply of grain, which may, in a season of scarcity, be converted into food.—Essay on the Princ. of Population, p. 160. Lond. 1803. [67] Anderson, vol. i. pp. 39, 83.

was introduced into Europe about the year 813; the art of distillation about the year 1150.

In the commercial history of this period, it is important to notice the introduction of bills of exchange, which so much facilitated commercial operations. Anderson has supposed, that this kind of negotiation was practised in the year 1189, but without sufficient authority[68]. Macpherson refers its original to letters of credit, addressed successively by Richard and John, kings of England, to the merchants of Italy, in favour of the agents employed by them in that country, the second instance occurring in the year 1202. Though these letters were not strictly bills of exchange, yet the transition to such a contrivance was so obvious, especially in a country maintaining a very general commerce, and receiving money from all the west, that it may be believed to have been adopted nearly about the same time. The first express mention, however, of bills of exchange, must be referred to the year 1255[69], in which the Roman pontiff authorised the Italians, who had advanced money for the conquest of the kingdom of Sicily, to draw upon the English prelates for sums alleged to have been advanced to them by merchants of Sienna and Florence. Modern Europe thus appears to be indebted for this commodious contrivance of transferring mercantile credits, and thereby avoiding the hazard and expense of reciprocal remittances of money, to the same ecclesiastical influence, to which it owes so much of its political combination. The convenience of merchants may have previously suggested such an expedient; but the extended connexions, the pecuniary exactions, and the political ar-

[68] Macpherson, vol. i. pp. 348, 367. [69] Ibid., p. 405. De Pauw, in his Recherches Philos. sur les Grecs, tome i. p. 335, Berlin, 1787, has expressed an opinion, that an instance of a bill of exchange drawn at Athens, may be found in the Trapeziticus of Isocrates. The transaction, however, there mentioned, seems to have been merely a casual accommodation, and not managed in a commercial form. A young foreigner at Athens, who expected to receive a remittance from his father, met with a merchant, who was preparing to return to the country of the foreigner with a sum of money, and prevailed with him to give the money, on receiving a letter addressed to the father for repayment. The merchant declined to comply until he had received the security of a banker.—Isocr. Trapez., pp. 365, 366. H. Steph., 1593.

rangements of the papacy, were sure to favour the progress of commercial contrivance, by rendering familiar to traders a method of negotiating their payments.

The modern system of funding appears also to have had its commencement within the period at present considered, and to have, at the same time, given occasion to the establishment of the original bank, which was, in truth, but an office for the management of a public debt. The republic of Venice, grievously exhausted in a struggle with the Greek emperors, who had become jealous of its commercial prosperity, was, about the year 1175, reduced to the necessity of having recourse to a forced loan[70], which was levied in proportion to the fortunes of the citizens; and, for the satisfaction of the public, a bank was established, at which the interest was paid, and the shares transferred, agreeably to the directions of the creditors, to other persons. Though this bank was thus, in its very origin, connected with the government, and the state did actually, on two occasions, convert its funds to the use of the public, its credit continued unimpaired[71]. The first bank of exchange and deposit is said to have been established at Barcelona, in the first year of the fifteenth century[72].

A currency of credit is said to have been established in very ancient times[73], as we are told that the Carthaginians used for money some unknown substance, inclosed in sealed purses, made of leather. Of the result of the contrivance we have not been informed, nor how long it continued to maintain its credit[74]. In the confidence of a free

[70] Hist. de Venise, par Laugier, tome ii. p. 120.—Macpherson, vol. i. p. 341. [71] Ibid., vol. i. p. 342. [72] Ibid., note.

[73] Æschinis Socratici Dialogi Tres, p. 82. Amst. 1711. [74] Within the period of history considered in this chapter, an attempt was made in China to introduce a paper currency, for the relief of the government, but it failed through the want of confidence. The use of the precious metals was, in the year 1236, prohibited in that country, except as they might be required for the emperor; and notes were issued, which were formed of the middle bark of the mulberry-tree. The scheme was abandoned after some years. It was resumed in the year 1368, but it then entirely failed. The example of China was, in the year 1294, imitated in Persia. It lasted there, however, but three days, and ended in the ruin of the monarch. The more orderly government of China could compel submission for a time; in

and mercantile government this may have been supported. In our own time and country the experiment of public confidence has been fully tried, and it has been ascertained, that it may sustain a currency of credit in the most difficult circumstances, without any other diminution of conventional value, than such, as would equally affect a currency of intrinsic value, if its quantity had been equally augmented.

CHAPTER XXIII.

Of the history of Learning, from the suppression of the western empire, in the year 476, *to the commencement of the fourteenth century.*

Ecclesiastical learning cultivated in Ireland in the eighth century—Teachers supplied to the continent in the ninth—among these, Johannes Scotus Erigena, the founder of the scholastic theology—afterwards improved by Lanfranc and Anselm, and completed by Abeillard—Scientific learning acquired from the Arabs of Spain, by Gerbert, who, in the year 999, became pope, by the name of Sylvester III.—Medical school of Salerno received its knowledge from the Arabs—Mathematics and chemistry also furnished by them—Communication of Arabic poetry probably begun in the year 1085—Lyric poetry of the *troubadours* of France begun towards the close of the eleventh century—Romance-writing of the *trouveurs* of France, towards the middle of the twelfth—Sicilian school of Italian poetry, towards the same time—Many Italian poets before the middle of the thirteenth.

THAT learning, which had graced the imperial government of Rome, soon yielded to the combined operation of various causes of decay, some of which inwardly consumed the principle of intellectual vigour, and others, by an external and violent agency, repressed and crushed its energies. Cicero appears to have anticipated the decay of that eloquence, which he himself had so zealously cultivated[1]. The prediction was speedily fulfilled, for, about the close of the first century of the Christian era, the causes of its

Persia, neither fear nor confidence maintained the currency.—Malcolm's Hist. of Persia, vol. i. pp. 431—436.

[1] Tuscul. Disput. lib. ii. cap. ii.

actual corruption were investigated in a treatise, which has been ascribed by some to Quintilian, by others to Tacitus. The chilling influence of despotism rapidly prevailed; the oratory and the poetry of the age of Augustus degenerated into the pedantry of grammarians; and, when the external causes of decay began to operate, little could be found qualified to excite our regrets. Aulus Gellius, who lived after the middle of the second century, has, in his *Noctes Atticæ*, reviewed the literature of his age, and, with the single exception of his master, the philosopher Favorinus, has recorded only the names and pretensions of obscure grammarians and rhetoricians[2]. How low indeed the Roman literature had then fallen from its height is sufficiently indicated by the commendation bestowed, in this work, on Sulpicius Apollinaris, and claimed by that writer himself, as the only person at that time capable of understanding the writings of Sallust. Poetry, however, seems to have degenerated less rapidly than oratory, probably because it appeals to nature, and depends less on the modifications of society. Though the classic poetry of the age of Augustus was immediately succeeded by the declamatory versification of Lucan and Juvenal, by the tenuity of Silius Italicus, and by the bombast of Statius, yet even in the fourth century Claudian, however liable in a still greater degree to the same imputation of the last-mentioned writer, could compose poems, which may now be read with gratification.

The first of the external causes, which added their destructive power to the wasting influence of internal decay, was the removal of the seat of government, with the establishment of it in a country, in which a different and more cultivated language was indigenous. The necessary evil of this great change was aggravated by the subsequent division of the empire, which restored indeed a local government to Italy, but interrupted its communication with the still existing literature of Greece. The Latin language could yet, it is true, boast some little lustre; but the genius of Italy was exhausted, almost all the Latin writers of this time being strangers[3]. Claudian was an Egyptian; Ausonius, Prosper, and Sidonius Apollinaris,

[2] Hist. Litt. d'Italie, par Ginguené, tome i. p. 20. [3] Ibid., p. 45.

were Gauls; Prudentius, a Spaniard; Aurelius Victor, an African; and Ammianus Marcellinus, a native of Antioch. The introduction of barbarians into the Roman armies, even into high stations of dignity and command, must have hastened the corruption of the Roman literature; an uninterrupted succession of calamitous wars, foreign or domestic, must have been ruinous to the interests of learning, as it destroyed the leisure of study, without presenting the excitement of triumph; and, at length, the doom of letters was sealed by the suppression of the western empire, which transferred Italy to the rude domination of successive tribes of the northern barbarians. Boethius, who was contemporary to the founder of the Gothic kingdom, and who perished by his barbarous severity, is considered as concluding the series of the Roman writers. While he awaited the sentence of the Gothic prince in the tower of Pavia, he composed his *Consolation of Philosophy*[4], the last ray of the literature of ancient Italy.

When causes so numerous, and so powerful, co-operated for the extinction of the learning of the west, it becomes an object of curiosity to enquire, what were those other causes, which preserved some remaining sparks, and thus enabled succeeding generations to relumine it in a more favourable period. These causes appear to have existed in the religion and the legislation of the ancient empire.

The emperors of the fourth century had encouraged a literary spirit among their Christian subjects[5], that they might be qualified to defend their religion against its pagan opponents, and, with this view, had erected libraries for their use. The barbarian conquerors of the empire, on the other hand, respected generally the ministers of reli-

[4] This interesting work supposes that the author, overwhelmed by misfortune, had called the muses to his assistance, and that, while they were administering their feeble succours, philosophy appeared, drove them away, as fitted only to soften, instead of strengthening the mind, and, by her instructions, enabled him to recover his tranquillity. It is composed miscellaneously, in prose and verse, the latter of various measures. The prose is corrupted with many barbarisms of the age, but the verse often resembles that of a purer period.—Ginguené, pp. 56, 57.

[5] Within the fourth and fifth centuries, accordingly, were distinguished Hilary of Poitiers, Lactantius, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustin, and Sulpitius Severus, who has been named the Christian Sallust.

gion, amidst all their depredations, and the convents became the asylums of the literary treasures of antiquity, and the schools of the more ignorant of the middle ages[6]. Theodoric, the first Gothic sovereign of Italy, having employed, as his minister, the learned Cassiodorius[7], this eminent man exerted his influence with considerable success for the protection of letters, until a renewal of the troubles of that unhappy period deprived him of every hope; he then retired into a monastery, which he had founded at Monte Cassino, and, collecting an ample library, cherished for better times the precious remains of literature. While the monasteries preserved the writings of the ancients, the ritual of the church preserved some relics of the language, in which they were composed. Nor was the influence of religion confined to the protection of literature, but was extended to such science as was then known[8]; this, indeed, was effectually promoted by the contentions of the church, for the dispute so violently agitated, about the proper day for celebrating the resurrection of Christ[9], gave occasion

[6] 'For five centuries together, reckoning from the Gothic establishments in Italy, we find no one distinguished in any degree by learning, who had not received a monastic education; and we might trace, in this way, a succession of scholars, and an inheritance of intellectual wealth.'—Introd. to the Lit. Hist. of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Cent., p. 66. Lond. 1798. [7] Ibid., p. 34.

[8] The sytem of instruction, communicated in the schools of Ireland, from which the ecclesiastical learning of the west was chiefly derived, comprehended, at least professedly, the seven liberal arts, as they were then distinguished, grammar, geometry, mechanics, arithmetic, music, astronomy, and versification.—Rer. Hib. Script. Vet. a C. O'Conor, epist. nuncup., p. 244. Lond. 1814. We may smile at such an enumeration; but the system, however defective, must at least have preserved some tradition of these several subjects of instruction.

[9] The Asiatic Christians observed, as the day of Easter, that which followed next but one after the fourteenth day of the first Jewish month, without any reference to the days of the week; whereas the Europeans deemed it necessary to fix the commemoration of the resurrection of Christ to Sunday, that day of the week, on which the event had actually occurred. This dissension, which had been begun in the second century, was terminated in the year 325, when the council of Nice established the practice of the Europeans, as the general rule of the church.—Mosh., Cent. 2, part ii. ch. ii. For determining the time of the full moon, or fourteenth day of the month, the Jewish months being lunar, the lunar cycle, anciently invented by Meton, was adopted by the council; but it was after-

to a strict observation of the lunar period, as the desire of adhering more closely to the received regulation has since given occasion to a correct determination of that of the sun[10].

The study of the Roman law, in some degree continued through the darkest times, was, however, the principal cause, why, when Latin had ceased to be a living language, it was still employed throughout Europe for the purpose of composition, and became the common instrument of literary communication. A digest of the code of Theodosius[11], prepared in the year 506 at the desire of Alaric the king of the Visigoths in Gaul, combined with the Roman law the usages of the Goths. The perpetual recurrence to such a standard of the Latin language must have maintained among the thinking classes some acquaintance with the ancient speech, and, while it checked the progress of corruption, must have determined them to retain, as the language of scholars, that which was still so far superior to the rude dialects of the northern nations.

From the suppression of the western empire, in the year 476, or at least from the death of Boethius, in the year 524, to the close of the eighth century, when the illustrious Charlemagne employed his utmost efforts for the restoration of learning, was a long interval of violence and ignorance. In this interval, the rough process was performed, by which the rude tribes of the north were incorporated with the corrupted nations of the south, and the necessary materials of new combinations of policy were prepared. Such a process, however in its conse-

wards discovered that the calculation would give an excess of one day in three hundred and twelve years, for which it was necessary to introduce a correction. On account of the observance of Sunday, a solar cycle was also required. [10] This was effected by pope Gregory X., in the year 1580, by the introduction of the corrected computation, named the new style, so near to the truth, that the error, in five thousand years, will only be a day and a half. It is obvious, that very small changes of the orbits of the sun and moon would have reduced the year to a precise number of revolutions of the earth, and have rendered it also an exact multiple of a lunar month. But such changes, while they facilitated the computation of time, would have diminished that necessity of accurate observation, which improved the science of astronomy. [11] Butler's Horæ Jurid. Subsec., pp. 80, 81.

quences important to the subsequent improvement of Europe, and of the world, was during its continuance inconsistent with the security, which is necessary for the cultivation of letters. If, therefore, the system of western Europe had, during this period of almost three centuries, been abandoned to the results of its own agitations, though the religion and jurisprudence of Rome might still have maintained some knowledge of its ancient language, the minds of men must have been long disqualified for recovering the learning, which that language comprehended, for even Charlemagne would have sought in vain, the instructors of his empire. But in the geographical and political arrangements of Europe, an asylum had been provided for the fugitives of religion and learning, when they should be driven away from the continent by the violences of this disastrous time. There they securely prosecuted and transmitted such studies, as were connected with their profession of christianity; and from this retreat, their successors were ready to become missionaries of religion and learning, for the instruction of the continental nations, as soon as these enjoyed some degree of tranquillity and leisure for listening to their precepts.

Whatever opinion may be entertained of the disputed question of Irish antiquity, no doubt can reasonably exist in regard to the important function discharged by this island, in sheltering the exiled learning of the continent of Europe. The express and unobjectionable testimony of Bede must be rejected, before it can be held, that ecclesiastical learning was not in this period diligently cultivated in Ireland, and that the most munificent liberality was not exercised towards numerous students of the adjacent island of Britain, who resorted thither for the instruction, which the troubled state of their own country denied to them at home. This our island, situated not only beyond the limits of the ancient empire, but also beyond the earlier ravages of the northern barbarians, was, as it were, a separate world, into which the disorder and violence of the other countries of the west were not admitted, and yet so near, that an easy communication was afforded for the transmission of the influences of reason and religion. Rude indeed it must be acknowledged was

the asylum, which it supplied; but mere tranquillity was important to those who fled from the struggle of barbarians, and this at least they found and enjoyed in Ireland.

Though Ireland also became at length a scene of northern depredation, the Danes having extended their ravages to this sequestered island, the visitation was well accommodated in time to the intellectual and religious interests of the continent, for it commenced just at the time[12], when the government of Charlemagne was fully established, and the improvement of his dominions demanded, that men capable of communicating instruction should even be forced from their retreat. Indeed the whole of this operation appears to have been most curiously combined. It was the opinion of Mezeray[13], that the Saxon war of Charlemagne gave the impulse to the descents made by the Normans on the coast of France, these northern barbarians, who had been driven backward by the arms of the French, seeking vengeance in this manner on the conquerors of their country, and the adversaries of their religion; and we may also with probability ascribe to the same cause those other enterprises, by which they sought to acquire settlements beyond his power. The times of the events correspond sufficiently to this latter conjecture. Charlemagne[14] began his great war with the Saxons in the year 772, in which he plundered their famous temple at Paderborn in Westphalia[15]; and twenty-five years after that time, the first wandering party of Danish pirates[16] appeared on the coast

[12] The first appearance of the Danish invaders on the coast of Ireland, was referred by Usher, to the year 797, in which they landed on the island of Rathlin, adjacent to its northern shore. In the following year they effected a landing on the western coast of Munster.—O'Halloran's Introd. to and Hist. of Ireland, vol. iii. pp. 148, 152. Dubl. 1803. [13] Abrégé Chron. tome i. p. 508. [14] Ibid., p. 467. [15] In which they worshipped the idol Irminsaul, supposed to have been a statue or column, erected in honour of Arminius, who had been the champion of their liberty in their struggle with the Roman government.—Henault's Chron. Abridgm., vol. i. p. 48. Pfeffel, tome i. p. 26. [16] These, though all named Danes, appear from the Irish accounts, to have been composed, not only of various tribes, but even of different nations. One tribe, named Leth-Manni, is supposed by Usher to have been composed of Livonians, the country of these people having been named Letten or Letta. Others were named Fionne-Gail and Dubh-

of Ireland. It seems then to be a reasonable conclusion, that the long series of hostility, which subdued and civilised Germany, sent abroad these maritime ravagers, who drove from Ireland[17] the teachers of learning and religion, to give their valuable assistance in the improvement of an empire, which has been the foundation of the modern polity of Europe. Nor does the influence of our island, in extending her important aid to the continent, appear to have been limited to the direct supply of instructors, which was afforded in the time of Charlemagne. Iceland has been described as discharging a similar function, in awakening the literary spirit of the north; and this remoter island[18] appears to have received from Ireland its earliest knowledge of letters and religion, and to have furnished to Denmark and Norway their *scalds*, or bardic chroniclers.

The claim of Irish antiquity presents itself, like those

Gail, the words *fionne* and *dubh* signifying *white* and *black*. The former were, probably, Danes, Swedes, and Norwegians, who have light hair; the others, Germans.—O'Halloran, vol. iii. p. 149. General Vallancey conjectured, that the black invaders had a mixture of French blood and features; certainly, he adds, Tuscans are mentioned among the northern invaders of England.—Collect. de Reb. Hib., vol. i. pp. 517, 518. Dubl. 1786. [17] Mezeray has remarked, that the fury of the northern pagans was particularly directed against the clergy and the monks, in revenge of the cause of their own religion, driven northwards by the French.—Abr. Chron., tome i. p. 508. The monasteries of Ireland had been respected in all the commotions of the pentarchy preceding the Danish invasions. O'Conor, Proleg. part ii. p. 165. If we add to this consideration, that other of the Norman establishment formed within France itself, which so powerfully influenced the characters and fortunes of the two great governments of France and England, we shall perceive an extraordinary example of the wide diffusion of the agency of political causes. [18] It is admitted by the historians of Norway and Denmark, that the *scalds* were introduced into these countries from Iceland, that some of the first settlers of Iceland were Irish, that the first churches were erected there by Irish monks, and that letters, still named *Ira litur*, were brought thither from this country. It is particularly mentioned, that the first Norwegian settlers found there Irish books. It is agreed, that Iceland was not inhabited before the year 874, at which time the Danes, possessing themselves of the maritime places of Ireland, drove the inhabitants from their country. Thus the barbarous incursions of the Danes appear to have circuitously operated to the refinement of their own country. Poets among the Irish were named *scealuidhe* or narrators of events.—O'Conor, Epist. Nuncup., pp. 26, 27

towers[19] which characterise the country, simple, but not wholly artless, venerable for a duration which embarrasses inquiry, and perplexing our speculations concerning the purpose for which they had been erected. Mr. O'Conor has recently, however, analysed the question, and appears

[19] These buildings appear, however, not to be absolutely peculiar to Ireland, and their style of architecture seems even to have proceeded to this country across the continent, from the bank of the Ganges. Lord Valentia, in his progress from Calcutta to Benares, discovered at Bhaugulpore two round towers, and has remarked, that they much resembled those of Ireland, except that they were more ornamented.—Travels in India, &c., vol. i. p. 85. Lond., 1809. A round tower was also discovered by professor Pallas on the ruins of the ancient city of Bolgari, nine versts from the Volga, of which he has given an exact delineation, with some observations, in the first volume of his travels in Russia, in the year 1768, p. 184. Paris, 1788. Sir Charles Giesecckè, professor of mineralogy to the Dublin Society, has informed the author, that there are towers similar to those of this country, on the island of Oland, on low ground near to the shore opposite to the main-land, where they are named *warris*, equivalent to the English word *wary*. These he supposed to have been erected in the twelfth century, to observe the approach of pirates, when the commerce of the country was beginning to be prosperous. He also remarked, that he has seen similar buildings in various parts of Germany, particularly on the Rhine, where they are named *warten*, which is equivalent to the verb *expect*. These are always situated near castles, and are supposed to have been watch-towers, rendered necessary by the violences of the feudal system. Mr. O'Conor has quoted authorities to prove, that at Corunna in Spain, there was a very high *pharos*, of excellent workmanship, *ad speculum Britanniæ*, said to have been erected by Hercules.—Proleg., part i. p. 49. The round towers of Ireland, of which eighty-four have been enumerated by Ledwich, have been described, by Giraldus Cambrensis, as *turres ecclesiasticæ*, probably belfries. Even in the time of Giraldus, or in the twelfth century, they must have been very ancient, since this writer has alleged, that in calm weather such were seen by fishermen beneath the waters of Lough Neagh. These buildings were, probably, of a primitive order of simple architecture, indifferently applied to any purpose which it might suit. That they should have been peculiarly numerous in this country, and have here acquired, or recovered, an ecclesiastical character, may, perhaps, be explained by the circumstances, which in pagan, as in Christian times, procured for it the appellation of *the holy island*. Mr. Petrie has concluded that these towers have been erected from the sixth to the twelfth century, both included, and especially in the ninth and tenth; and that they have been designed principally for belfries, but also for places of safe retreat, and for beacons to guide travellers to monasteries. Trans. of the Royal Irish Acad. vol 20.

to have shown, that the claim does fairly extend to the age of the first of the Ptolemies[20], or about three centuries before the Christian era; that the paganism of this island was, probably, the religion of the Druids[21], received from a Phœnician origin; and that its early inhabitants were composed of two distinct classes of Celtic tribes, one of which had migrated from Gaul and Britain, and the other[22], which became predominant, from the northern coast of Spain. The inquiry is connected with the present subject, as it may justify an opinion, that the earlier circumstances of this country contained some peculiarities, which were favour-

[20] Tigernach, the Irish annalist, acknowledges the uncertainty of all traditions preceding this period. He died at an advanced age, in the year 1088, and was, therefore, more ancient by a whole age than any of the chroniclers of the northern nations of Europe. England can oppose to this pretension only the Saxon chronicle, the antiquity of which, as it is now extant, is questionable, since it extends to the year 1154, and the author is unknown. Tigernach, it should be observed, quotes with minuteness more ancient authorities.—O'Conor, Epist. Nunc., pp. 32, 33, 117—119; Proleg., part i. p. 25, part ii. p. 174. [21] The name *Druid* is the Irish *draoithe*, which is found not only in the Irish annals, but also in the Irish version of the gospel of Matthew, where it is employed to signify the wise men of the east. Festus Avienus, who wrote in the fourth century, has declared, that Ireland was named *sacred* by the ancients.—Ibid., p. 61. The most probable solution of this appellation is, that it was the peculiar seat of the Druidic religion. Festus Avienus was a Spaniard, and professed to have derived his relations *ex imis Phœnicum annalibus*.

[22] That such a colonization is probable, may be inferred from the opinion of Tacitus, that the Silures of Britain had, probably, migrated from the same country.—Vit. Agric., cap. xi. Cambden thought it not strange, that many should come into Ireland from so poor a country as the north of Spain.—Britan., vol. ii. 1316. Lond. 1722. That this country was in ancient times frequented by navigators sailing from Cadiz is attested by Aristides, a Greek writer, whose testimony Mr. Turner has quoted from the notes of Gesner, on the Argonautica.—Hist. of England, vol. i. p. 240. This historian also remarks that, unless it be supposed to have been visited by Phœnician or Carthaginian merchants, we must be unable to explain why it had been known by name to various Greek writers, long before they or the Romans explored the Irish ocean. The written tradition has been traced by Mr. O'Conor through Irish authorities, as far as the sixth century.—Proleg., part i. p. 104, part ii. p. 26. General Vallancey has quoted six Spanish writers, by whom it has been recorded. —Collect., vol. iv. number xiv. p. 325, &c. The tradition is still orally preserved in that country, especially at Corunna as the place of departure.

able to the reception of the banished learning of the continent. A people trained to the cultivation of Druidic learning[23], and long accustomed to seek their chief gratification in the delights of music and poetry[24], though the Druids were naturally adverse to the introduction of a religion which would destroy their own importance and authority, was not unprepared for regarding with extreme respect the professors of a different school, as soon as they should have been themselves proselyted to the religion of these strangers.

Assisted by the instructors supplied from this retreat[25], Charlemagne directed his efforts to the restoration of learn-

[23] Of their philosophy, Cæsar gives the following account, De Bello Gallico, lib. vi. cap. xiii. In primis hoc volunt persuadere, non interire animas, sed ab aliis post mortem transire ad alios: atque hoc maxime ad virtutem excitari, metu mortis neglecto. Multa præterea de sideribus, atque eorum motu, de mundi ac terrarum magnitudine, de rerum natura, de Deorum immortalium vi ac potestate disputant, et juventuti tradunt. The Druids subsisted in Ireland so late as in the year 1166.—O'Conor, Proleg. part i. pp. 28, 29.

[24] Cæsar says of the youth educated by the Druids of Gaul, magnum ibi numerum versuum ediscere dicuntur. Itaque nonnulli annos vicenos, in disciplina permanent.—De Bello Gallico, lib. vi. cap. xiii. He adds, indeed, that these verses were not committed to writing, but speaks of this as voluntary. Strabo thus speaks of the Turditani of Spain: these are judged to be the most learned of all the Spaniards, and use grammar, and have written monuments of antiquity, and poems, and laws included in metres, from six thousand years.—Strabonis, Ter. Geogr., tome i. p. 182. Oxon. 1807. That poetry was very early cultivated in Ireland, is proved by Mr. O'Conor, not only from the testimony of Adamnanus, who lived in the seventh century, but from the citations of more ancient bards, found in the writings of the annalists.—Proleg., part ii. pp. 66, 67. The poems ascribed to Ossian have been, however, rejected by this candid antiquary, as inconsistent with chronology, bringing together Cucullin or Concullanus, who died in the second year of the Christian era, Fingal or Fumo mac Cumhail, and Ossian or Oissin, who lived in the third century, Saint Patric, who died at the end of the fifth, and the Lochlans or Danes who were not known before the ninth.—Ibid. p. xii. The objection extends to the most ancient Irish poems ascribed to Ossian, which Mr. O'Conor has referred to the thirteenth or fourteenth century.—Epist. Nuncup., p. 101.

[25] Even that portion, which was furnished immediately by England, may yet be considered as primarily Irish, for that the literature of the Anglo-Saxons was received from Ireland, is allowed by Bede, Aldhelm, and Alcuin. Schools, indeed, were established by the Irish among the Anglo-Saxons themselves.—Ibid., pp. 242—248.

ing. Disgusted, it is said[26], by the barbarous style of a petition, presented to him by certain monks, who addressed him in the vernacular dialect, he formed the resolution of establishing schools, that the Latin tongue might not experience a similar corruption. One of these was erected in each of the cathedral churches and of the richer abbeys, theology being taught in the more considerable, and the Latin language in the others; and the plan was completed by founding the two principal seminaries of Rheims and Paris, afterwards denominated universities, and celebrated, especially that of the capital, for the learned men who there received their education. The teachers of these schools he received chiefly from Ireland. Eagerly availing himself of the arrival of learned strangers from this island, he placed them in these institutions, that they might impart to his subjects the information which they possessed. Such was the influence of this encouragement, that a French writer[27] has described almost the whole population of the island, with a train of philosophers, as migrating to the new Solomon.

Though, however, the efforts of Charlemagne had, in the beginning of the ninth century, introduced among his clergy such a portion of learning, as then preserved them from degenerating into general and total ignorance, it was stated in the synod of Rheims[28], after the lapse of but a single century, that at Rome itself, scarcely any individual possessed so much learning as was necessary for a porter. The tenth century was accordingly[29] the darkest hour of the night of the middle ages. At its termination, however, the light of knowledge began to dawn, as the day-spring appeared from among the Arabs of Spain.

[26] Esprit des Croisades, tome ii. p. 352. [27] Quid Hiberniam memorem, inquit Erricus Autisiodorensis, contempto pelagi discrimine, pene totam, cum grege philosophorum, ad nostra Gallicana litora migrantem, quorum quisquis peritior est, ultro sibi indicit exilium, ut Salomoni sapientissimo famuletur ad votum.—Ibid., Proleg., part i. p. 139. [28] Bruckerii Hist. Crit. Philos., per. ii. part ii. lib. ii. cap. ii. sec. 36. Leipsiæ, 1766, 1767. [29] 'This however,' says Mr. Hallam, 'is much rather applicable to Italy and England, than to France and Germany.' Introd. to the Literature of Europe etc., vol. i. p. 10. Lond. 1837—1839. According to him the seventh century was the *nadir* of the human mind in Europe, and its recovery began with Charlemagne. Ibid. p. 5, note *. This may explain the relative superiority of France and Germany in the tenth century.

Gerbert, an ecclesiastic of France, had in early life been placed in the family of a count of Barcelona[30], and during his residence in Spain had visited Cordova and Seville, in which places he profited by the instructions of the Arabian professors. The reputation of the various learning[31], which he had thus acquired, introduced him to the sovereigns of Germany and France, and procured for him several appointments in both these countries; and in the year 999 he was, under the name of Sylvester II., advanced to the papal throne, which had been in the same century dishonoured by monsters of profligacy, but at this time became, for the space of four years and a half, the seat of genius and science. The superior attainments of this eminent man in natural knowledge, had, indeed, been regarded by the ignorant multitude as the fruit of a communication with evil spirits, and even a cardinal had originated the accusation[32]; but, however he might have been traduced by the uninformed or the malicious, his example could not fail to excite many persons to exercise their intellectual faculties, in the various countries of France, Germany and Italy, in which it was successively displayed.

From the time of Gerbert, the schools of the Arabs of Spain were respected as the sources of science. The studious of the Christian countries of the west, resorted to them for instruction, in all the departments of metaphysical, mathematical, and natural knowledge; and translations of their books, which had themselves, however, chiefly been translated from the writings of the Greeks, were eagerly sought, and studied with all the curiosity of new discovery. Nor was this the only channel through which the science of the Arabs was conveyed to the Christians of Europe, for a communication was also established between that people and the southern Italians, the hostile incursions of the Arabs assuming gradually the relations of amicable intercourse, as they acquired a fixed possession of some districts of the country.

[30] Berrington's Litt. Hist. of the Middle Ages, pp. 202, 203. Lond. 1814. [31] He earned the praise of a great orator, poet, philosopher, and mathematician; but more especially excited the admiration of his contemporaries by his mathematical learning, and his skill in constructing hydraulic machines.—Bruckerus, per. ii. part ii. lib. ii. cap. ii. sec. 41. [32] Ibid.

The most generally attractive part of the scientific communications of the Arabs, was a translation of the metaphysics of Aristotle, which, with his treatises on physics and morals, were by them first made known to the western Christians[33]. The logic of that philosopher was, indeed, known long before, for Boethius had made some translations from the original, and Charlemagne had procured from Constantinople a copy, which was consulted by Alcuin and Bede. This part of his writings had, accordingly, been studied in Latin translations made directly from the original Greek, though the Introduction of Porphyry, preserved by Boethius, and a treatise on the categories, or classes of philosophical distribution, attributed to Augustin, were the more general sources of information. To his logic the Arabs, at the end of the twelfth century, added the other works of Aristotle, disfigured, however, by the errors of their own translation, and perplexed by the subtleties of their commentators, the most celebrated of whom were Averrhoes and Avicenna. Possibly, says the later historian of the modern philosophy, the knowledge of these other works might have gradually conducted the Europeans to the attainment of more reasonable principles; but corrupted as they were in the transmission, they served to augment the intricacy of the labyrinth of disputation, in which all minds were then entangled.

A communication thus corrupted, was not, however, ill adapted to the circumstances of those by whom it was received, for the subtleties of this disputatious philosophy gave full exercise to the minds of the unpractised reasoners of Europe. The habits of disputation, which it formed, induced a hardihood of controversy, which was speedily indulged in the discussion of the most important subjects; and the freedom, unavoidably permitted in disputation, afforded an opportunity, and a pretext, for hazarding and maintaining the most obnoxious opinions. The tendency of this intellectual discipline was early apprehended[34], and accordingly, in the beginning of the thirteenth century, the philosophy of Aristotle was proscribed in Paris and in Rome, as favouring the errors of heresy; but the gratifica-

[33] Hist. de la Philos. Moderne, par Buhle, tome i. pp. 696, &c. Paris, 1816. [34] Bruckerus, per. ii. part ii. lib. ii. cap. iii. sec. i. vi.

tion, experienced from the exercise of mental ingenuity, prevailed over the defensive caution of the hierarchy, and in the same century the reprobated system was, by the labours of Thomas Aquinas and of Albertus Magnus, established in more than its former celebrity. Public disputation, indeed, was the only mode in which opinions could be discussed, when the art of printing had not yet furnished the means of propagating with facility written knowledge.

The philosophy of Aristotle was, in western Europe, converted into a new science, which has been named the scholastic theology, or philosophy, according as it was, or was not, connected with the questions of religious controversy. As this our island supplied the ecclesiastical teachers of the ninth century, so, among them, did it produce the true founder of the scholastic theology[35], Johannes Scotus Erigena, the last of which names signifies a native of Erin, or Ireland. The mystical notions of Scotus were derived from the reveries of an impostor of the fourth century, who pretended to be Dionysius the Areopagite, a disciple of saint Paul; and his knowledge of logic from Augustin and Boethius. Furnished with these resources, he taught at the court of Charles *the bald* of France, until the jealous apprehension of the Roman pontiff drove him into retirement. The controversy about transubstantiation, which was maintained by Berenger about the middle of the eleventh century, brought forward Lanfranc, who next distinguished himself in this field, and is considered by many as the father of the scholastic system[36]. Berenger employed the subtleties of logic in attacking the prevailing opinion concerning the eucharist, and Lanfranc used the same weapons in the defence of the doctrines of the church. The example of Lanfrac was followed with superior ability by Anselm, who, like Lanfranc, was born in Italy, taught in Normandy with distinguished reputation, and was then advanced to the archbishopric of Canterbury. At the close of the eleventh century was started the famous question of the nominalists and realists, which was properly a metaphysical discussion of the true signification of general terms, but was soon converted into a controversy

[35] Buhle, tome i. p. 674. [36] Mosheim's Eccles. Hist., cent. 11, part ii. ch. iii.

concerning the distinction of the persons of the divine Trinity. This controversy brought forward, about the year 1120, the celebrated Abeillard, who completed the system of the scholastic theology.

This eminent man, at first an admired teacher of philosophy, or rather of logic, appears to have been afterwards driven to theology by the misfortune, which punished his love for Heloisa[37]. Having sought a refuge from the world in the monastery of saint Denis, he was followed thither by the importunities of the students of Paris, anxious to continue to receive the benefit of his instructions, and was at length persuaded to comply with their request; but, conceiving that his monastic profession required that he should devote his attention to theology, and at the same time conscious that his reputation was founded on his philosophy, he determined to combine the two studies, alleging the example of Origen, as the first Christian philosopher. In this manner did the influence of a superior female[38] contributed to complete that combination of logic and religion, which chiefly exercised the intellectual power of the middle ages. The combination was, indeed, a corruption of the simple purity of the Christian faith; but, when men had wearied themselves with the discussions of the scholastic theology, they were better disposed to listen to the appeal, which the preachers of revelation made to the authority of the word of God.

It is the opinion of the historian of the modern philosophy, that the character of the scholastic system was much affected by this circumstance[39], that it received its

[37] Berington's Lives of Abeillard and Heloisa, p. 127. Birmingham, 1787. [38] The poem of Pope, by which the name of Heloisa is principally known, has done much injustice to her character, by representing her as the slave of licentious passions. An enthusiastic admirer of philosophy, she loved Abeillard for his genius, and, in the bloom of life, with an exquisite sense of its enjoyments, she heroically submitted to the jealous mandate, by which he sentenced her to the idle seclusion of a convent, before he would himself seek such a retreat. She had objected to marriage, not for the profligate reason assigned by the poet, but that she might not obstruct the ecclesiastical advancement of the man whom she loved. He, though a canon, was not yet in holy orders, and, therefore, not yet bound by the recent law of celibacy.—Berington's Lives of Abeillard and Heloisa. [39] Luther himself had made a great progress in the

larger supply of the philosophy of Aristotle from the Arabs, and not from Constantinople; for, in this other case, he conceives, the reasoners of the west would have received, together with a correct text of the original, the writings of the Greek commentators, who understood their author, instead of being embarrassed at once by the errors of the translators, and by the vain efforts of ill informed commentators, labouring to reconcile what they did not understand. Under the influence of a circuitous and imperfect communication, the scholastic system, towards the close of the twelfth century, assumed a form of intricacy, which probably contributed much to discredit it, when it had sufficiently exercised the understandings of Europeans. Thomas Aquinas, however, who lived in the middle of the thirteenth century, established a reputation for superior subtlety, which to this day maintains his authority in the church of Rome.

While the scholastic theology was exclusively cultivated by the French, the studies of law and medicine received a large portion of attention in Italy, the former in the northern, the latter in the southern part of that country.

The political situation of Italy had prepared it for restoring the study of jurisprudence. The municipal independence of its numerous cities had directed the attention of the people to the consideration of their rights, and the multiplied relations of affluent and improved society had, at the same time, created a necessity for some more perfect system of regulation than was furnished by the institutions of the Lombards. The knowledge of the law of the ancient empire was accordingly cherished and restored, and, in the year 1128, Irnerus lectured on it at Bologna[40]. The civil law, when it had thus become the

most refined subtleties of scholastic learning, yet no one afterwards so strenuously condemned the application of the philosophy of Aristotle to theological inquiry. With his characteristic vehemence, indeed, he would have wholly exploded the philosophy of the Grecian sage; but in this, as in other matters, he was moderated by Melancthon.—Bayle's Dic., art. *Luther*, and *Melancthon*.

[40] Stephen silenced a professor of the civil and canon laws; Henry III. would not permit the Decretals of Gregory IX. to be taught in the schools of London; and Blackstone (book iv. ch. xxxiii.) remarks that, in the reign of Edward I., the laws of England

subject of academical lectures, was gradually extended, as an authoritative system, through all the western countries of Europe, England alone excepted. In this, it was successfully resisted by the common law, though even here, too, it was admitted as auxiliary to the decisions of the national code[41].

In that dark interval, in which the civil law of ancient Rome had lain neglected, the canon law of modern Rome had been gradually formed. This was collected by Gratian into his *Decree*, which was published about the year 1150, and became also in Bologna the subject of academic lectures. It was once remarked by doctor Browne, professor of civil law in the university of Dublin, in one of his prelections, that only in such an interval could it have been formed, the imperial legislation maintaining the supremacy of the civil power. The restoration, therefore, of the civil law, occurring at the very time when the materials of the canon law had been completed, must have very conveniently supplied Europe with those principles of temporal independence, by which the exorbitant pretensions of the papacy might best be repelled. The long and vehement contest about investitures, waged between the papal and imperial courts, had been compromised in the year

obtained a complete and permanent victory. Hume has remarked, that the jurisprudence of ancient Rome might have been admitted in this, as in other countries, if it had not become intimately connected with the canon law, which was the support of the papal power.—Hist., vol. iii. p. 320. [41] There are four species of courts, says Blackstone (Introd., sec. iii.), in which the civil and canon laws are permitted, under different restrictions, to be used; the ecclesiastical, the military, the courts of admiralty, and those of the two universities. He has also (book iii. ch. xxvii.) described the jurisprudence adopted in our courts of equity, as derived from the imperial and pontifical formularies, which had been introduced by clerical chancellors. Mr. Wooddeson has declared an opinion, that even our legal judicatures 'have been long acquainted with the use of the Roman institutions.'—Elements of Jurisprudence, p. 147. The principles of the Roman law were most remarkably introduced into the practice of our courts of common law, in the last century, by lord Mansfield, whose professional practice had been confined to the court of chancery. The law of insurance, in particular, rendered necessary, in his time, by the increasing commerce and opulence of England, was almost entirely formed by his decisions.—Butler's Sketch of the Professional Character of the Earl of Mansfield.

1122 by the *concordat* of Calixtus II.; but in the papacy of Innocent III., begun towards the close of the twelfth century, the temporal independence of Europe was assailed with a violence, which demanded the most strenuous resistance.

While the north of Italy was thus distinguished by the study of law, the south became not less celebrated for that of medicine, the school of Salerno having received from its Arabian neighbours the medical knowledge which these had acquired from the writings of Hippocrates and Galen. This study appears to have been gradually formed in Salerno, by an intercourse with some neighbouring Arabs[42], often hostile, yet occasionally amicable, before the arrival of the first Norman duke, who became master of Salerno in the year 1075. The school of this city acquired considerable reputation by the accession of a learned African, named Constantine[43], who had passed thirty-nine years in travelling for knowledge, and, on his return to his own country, had been compelled to seek in exile a refuge from the jealousy of his countrymen. Its reputation was established by the labours of the monks of Cassino, who had long employed themselves in medical, as in other studies[44], and eagerly availed themselves of the instruction afforded in the communications of the Arabs.

Other species of scientific knowledge were also received from this active and inquiring people, besides the medicine and the philosophy of the Greeks; these were mathematics and chemistry. To the Greeks they seem to have been indebted for a large portion of their geometry[45], while

[42] Giannone, lib. x. cap. xi. sez. iii. [43] Of this man, Giannone says, that by his travels in many parts of Asia and Africa, he had acquired a knowledge of various sciences, but particularly of medicine and astronomy; and that at Babylon he had learned grammar, logic, mathematics, astronomy, and medicine.—Ibid. [44] The monks of this place had applied themselves to the study of medicine in particular, from the time of John VIII., who was advanced to the papacy in the year 873.—Ibid. [45] Geometry was named by the Arabs *handassah*, which signifies *measure;* but the two sciences of geometry and arithmetic were almost always designated by the name *aklides*, or *oclides*, because the Greek Euclid had furnished the r principles.—D'Herbelot, art. *Handassah*, and *Aklides*. In the *Tahrir Hendassiat*, a collection of geometrical treatises, are contained the following;—the explication of Euclid; the *syntaxis magna* of Pto-

it is most probable that their knowledge of algebra was received from India, together with the decimal notation of arithmetic. Chemistry, on the other hand, appears to have been exclusively their own, the early nomenclature of that science, indeed, sufficiently attesting its Arabian original[46].

It has been supposed, that the Arabs had derived the principles of their algebraic science from a treatise on the properties of numbers, composed in the Greek language by Diophantus of Alexandria, who lived in the middle of the second century. Even if this were admitted, it might yet be true, that the science is of eastern origin, since Diophantus might have received in Alexandria, from an eastern source, the principles of his reasoning. Mr. Hutton, however, has rejected the supposition as insufficient and inadmissible, and has maintained the direct communication of this science from the Indians to the Arabs[47].

From two treatises, the *Leelawuttee* and the *Beej Gunnit*, or *Beja Gunnita*, which have been translated into the language of Persia, it appears that the Indians possessed a knowledge of algebra much superior to that which can be found in the treatise of Diophantus[48], and even to that,

lemy; the *data* of Euclid; the spherics of Theodosius; the spherics of Menelaus; the moveable sphere of Autolycus; the optics of Euclid; the book of Theodosius concerning night and day; a treatise on the rising and setting of the stars; the *ascendants* or *horoscopes* of Asclepius; a treatise of Aristarchus on the discs of the sun and moon; the *lemmas*, or theorems of Archimedes; the conics of Apollonius and Thabit Ben Corrah; a treatise of the knowledge and the extent of figures; Archimedes on the sphere and cylinder; and a treatise by Theodosius on the positions, or quiescence, of bodies.—Ibid., art. *Tahrir Hendassiat.* [46] *Alcohol, alkahest, aludel, alembic*, and *alkali*, are manifestly the terms of an Arabian science. [47] Tracts on Mathematical and Philosophical Subjects, vol. ii. tract xxxiii. Lond. 1812. It has latterly been supposed, that the decimal notation of arithmetic may have been received by the Arabs from the Egyptians. View of Anc. and Mod. Egypt, by Doctor Russell, p. 206. Edinb. 1831. All however which appears is, that they received from that people some of their numerals, as 1, 2, 3. [48] Diophantus composed in the Greek language thirteen books of algebra or arithmetic, of which only six have been hitherto printed; and also an imperfect book on the multangular numbers. These do not contain any treatise on the elementary parts of algebra, but only collections of difficult questions relating to square and cubic numbers, and other curious properties of numbers, with their solutions; and Diophantus

which was acquired by the Arabs[49]. All the rules of the science too are found in the manuscripts of India, nearly as they were stated by the Italian authors, who had received them from the Arabs; and with them are found the two rules of *false position*, which probably had given being to the more improved analysis of algebra. By the Arabs the science appears to have been communicated to the Christians through two different channels, for the Italians received it directly from the east[50], and we must suppose that the Christians of Spain were instructed by the Arabs of that country, though no distinct account of this communication has been transmitted, nor have any early treatises of algebra been discovered in the peninsula. To India we must, agreeably to the express acknowledgment of the Arabs themselves[51], refer the ingenious and most use-

has only prefixed to them an address to a person named Dionysius, for whose use they had probably been composed, mentioning in it certain principles, as if for the purpose of preparing him for the consideration of the problems.—Tracts on Math. and Phil. Subjects. Ibid. [49] From the book of Lucas de Burgo, the first European author, whose treatise on this art was printed, it appears, that the knowledge acquired by the Europeans from the Arabs extended only to quadratic equations, of which they used only the positive roots; that only one unknown quantity was employed; that no signs were substituted for either quantities or operations, except some few abbreviations of the words or names themselves; and that the art was applied only to the solution of certain numerical problems. It is indeed probable, that the Europeans did not learn from the Arabs the whole of what they knew on this subject, for an Arabic manuscript, said to contain a treatise on cubic equations, has been deposited in the library of the university of Leyden. But it has been discovered, that the Hindoos solved problems treating of several unknown quantities, with applications of algebra to geometrical and indeterminate questions.—Hutton, vol. ii. tract xxxiii. [50] The art was first imported into Italy from the east by Leonard Bonacci of Pisa, who composed his arithmetic in the year 1202, and published it a second time in the year 1228, subjoining the algebra as a part of the treatise. The name, given to it by Lucas de Burgo, was Alghebra e Almucabala, explained to signify, in the Arabic language, the art of restitution and comparison, or opposition and restoration, or resolution and equation. The present name is therefore compounded of the article *al* and the word *gebr*, which denotes the mode of reducing equations by transposing terms.—Ibid. [51] Baha-ul-din, the author of the Khalasat-ul-Hisah, who was born at Balbec in the year 1575, distinctly ascribes to the Indian sages the invention of the nine figures, employed to express numbers from unity to nine. The Arabian and Persian treatises also on algebra, like the earlier treatises of Europeans on the

ful contrivance, by which all numbers are represented in a decimal arrangement of ten characters, the basis of all the modern practice of arithmetic.

To the study of chemistry the Arabs appear to have been impelled by the joint influence of the two strong principles, which urge men to shun dissolution, and to acquire the means of enjoyment, for the transmutation of the baser metals into gold[52], and the conversion of gold into a universal remedy of disease, were the great objects of research. Forgetting the sensual paradise, which in the fervour of their fanaticism had stimulated their efforts, the disciples of Mohammed confined their views of happiness to the world, which they had conquered, and hoped to realise their utmost wishes by the assistance of chemistry. Their first systematic treatises on this subject are said to have been composed by Geber[53], who lived in the

same art, begin with arithmetic, which is called in them the arithmetic of the Indians.—Ibid. Mr. Hutton, to exhibit the gradual formation of our numerical characters, has given a table containing four series, one from the sanscrit, two of the Arabic or Persian, and one European. Doctor O'Conor, on the other hand, has shown that the characters expressing *seven* and *nine* had been invented by Tyro, the freedman of Cicero, and were used among the Irish, though merely as abbreviations of the syllables *et* and *us*. He has also remarked that the character expressing *five* was used in the Polyptychus Remigianus, written in the sixth century; that Rabanus Maurus in the ninth century said that it was numerical, expressing *six ounces;* and that all the nine characters, except those expressing *four* and *six*, are extant in a manuscript of the eleventh century, containing the works of Guido of Aretium. By these considerations he was much disposed to believe, that Gerbert, or Sylvester II., who is known to have written about numbers, applied to numeration characters already used in Europe for other purposes.—Proleg., part ii. pp. clxxvii.—clxxx. The question of the origin of the nine numeral characters is however quite distinct from that of the origin of the decimal notation; and Malmsbury tells us, that Gerbert first took from the Arabs his *abacus,* or table of numeration, and gave rules quæ a sudantibus abacistis vix intelliguntur. The application of the decimal notation to fractional numbers appears to have been separately the work of lord Napier, the inventor of logarithms and of Pitiscus, but especially of the former. Mem. of Napier, pp. 454, 455. Edinb. and Lond. 1834. [52] The alchemists pretend to resolve gold into its principles, and thus to extract a sulphur, which, being mixed with some other metal, as mercury or silver, should change it into gold.—Encycl., art. *Pierre Philosophale.* [53] Elements of Chem. Philos., by Sir H. Davy, introd., p. 10. London, 1812. D'Herbelot, art. *Geber* or *Giaber.*

third century of the hegira, or the ninth of the Christian era. To the Europeans their processes were probably first communicated in the time of the crusades. Arnold of Villa Nova[54], who is said to have died in the year 1250, was one of the earliest Europeans, who gave attention to these operations. His views were entirely similar to those of the Arabs, for he appears to have prosecuted the study only in the expectation of discovering the grand elixir and the philosopher's stone. Roger Bacon about the same time applied himself to experimental researches with more reasonable views, and with greater success[55], though he too was in some measure led aside from the pursuits of genuine philosophy by the visionary expectation of accomplishing the transmutation of metals. This early experimentalist[56] attests the origin of his knowledge, by continually quoting in his writings his Arabian masters, especially Avicenna, whom he names the prince of philosophers. Since in many particulars[57] Roger Bacon appears to have opened the way for the illustrious philosopher of the same name, who followed him at an interval of three centuries and a half[58], the Arabs may be thought justly entitled to be respected as the fathers of the improved philosophy even of the present time.

Chemistry, which was thus an Arabian science, was very curiously modified by the lively genius of the people, among whom it had its origin, the fairies and genii of the oriental tales being supposed to exercise a dominion over the elemental agencies of nature. This fanciful mythology found votaries even among the more sober inhabitants of Europe, where it gave being to the sect of the Rosicru-

[54] Elements of Chem. Philos., by Sir H. Davy, introd., p. 13. [55] The most important of his discoveries was the invention of gunpowder, of which however he appears to have contemplated only the explosive power, without proposing to render it instrumental to the projection of heavy bodies.—Bruckerus, per. ii. part. ii. lib. ii. c. iii. sect. ii. § xxiii.

[56] Turner's History of England, vol. i. p. 485. [57] Mr. Foster has pointed out several particulars in the philosophy of the elder Bacon, to justify this observation.—Mahometanism Unveiled, vol. ii. p. 313. London, 1829. It is to be lamented that the author of this very interesting work should, in his fondness for a favourite speculation, have been led to represent the promise made to Ishmael as a covenant of God, contrary to Gen. xvii. 21. [58] Roger Bacon died in the year 1284, lord Bacon in the year 1628.

sians[59], who taught that *gnomes*, *sylphs*, *nymphs*, and *salamanders*, were the presiding powers of their operations; and the strange persuasion, that it was possible to acquire a control over these imaginary beings, and to render them subservient to the gratification of the wishes of men, long supported the hope of discovering the two valued secrets of chemical inquiry. When the later Bacon reviewed the state of philosophy in his own time, he doubted whether the operations of alchemy and magic were fitter subjects of laughter, or of tears[60]; but he himself has compared them to the labour employed in digging for gold, supposed to have been buried in a field, which, though disappointed of its proposed object, was amply rewarded by the increased fertility of the soil. These visionary speculations have actually prepared the science, in which Davy has rendered subservient to the most extensive discoveries of nature, not indeed the *sylphs* and *gnomes* of the Rosicrusians, but the pervading energies of the electric fluid.

A people, which could introduce so much of the imagination into their speculations of philosophy, may well be supposed to have exercised a powerful influence in restoring and modifying the literature of western Europe. To the Arabs accordingly has been ascribed the agency, which chiefly gave being both to the prose composition and to the poetry of its modern nations.

The care employed by Charlemagne, in protecting and encouraging learning, was not limited to ecclesiastical knowledge. Anxious to improve the native literature of his people, he formed a collection of the military songs of the Germans[61], which he even transcribed with his own hand. His own fame has suppressed this poetical collection, his adventures and those of his captains[62] supplying

[59] The origin of this society is ascribed to a certain German, named Rosencreuz, who travelled through Asia and Africa in the fourteenth century; but it was however really formed early in the seventeenth, in ridicule of the public credulity, which it appears to have 'deceived.—Bruckerus, per. iii. part. i. lib. iii. c. iii. § xxxiii. xxxiv. When the mythology of this sect had been exploded by philosophy, it was adopted by Pope, as the machinery of his elegant little poem, the Rape of the Lock. [60] Novum Organum, lib. i. aphor. 85. [61] Le Grand, Fabliaux du 12 et 13 Siècles, tome i. pref.

[62] The most favourite military song was that, which recorded the defeat of his army at Roncesvalles among the Pyrenees. Whether

topics much more interesting than those of their predecessors; but the Teutonic bards, whose compositions he thus endeavoured to preserve from oblivion, may be considered as the fathers of the poetry of France, and of modern Europe.

France was not however dependent for its poetry on a single original. Communicating not only with the Germans, but also with the Arabs, both of the east and of Spain, it received contributions from both nations, and before the end of the period considered in the present book, poured into Italy itself the first scanty stream of modern genius, derived from the latter source. Divided as the country was by the Loire[63] into two distinct regions of literature, differing not only in the nature of their productions, but also in the very dialect, in which these were composed, it seems in the northern provinces to have been influenced by the Germans and the Arabs, in the southern to have received the character of its modern literature wholly from the latter.

In estimating the respective pretensions of the northern *scalds*, of the Arabs, and of the classical writers of antiquity, who appear also to have had some concern in the work, to the credit of originating the romantic fiction of

on account of the tragic nature of the event, or because it was fitted to excite shame and indignation, or because it was superior in merit, it became the most usual song of combat, and was sung in particular at the battle of Hastings.—Ibid. [63] The northern provinces were the region of the romances of chivalry, which were anciently composed in metre; the southern were the territory of a lighter species of poetry, devoted chiefly to amorous subjects. The dialects of the two districts were distinguished by the different denominations of *langue-d'oil* and *langue-d'oc*, derived from the different forms of the monosyllable of assent, which has become *oui* in the maturer language of France. The two dialects were originally comprehended under the common denomination of the *romance*-language, intended to express a modification of the Roman, or Latin tongue, as distinguished from that of Germany; but, when the poets of the south had given such celebrity to their peculiar dialect, that it began to be considered as a distinct language, under the distinct name of *provençal*, the appellation which had belonged to both, became limited to the northern district, where it was gradually improved into the modern French, and the compositions of the northern poets received the name of romances. The poets of the north were named *trouveurs*, those of the south *troubadours*, each appellation being equivalent to the word *poet*, as each signifies *inventor*.

the northern provinces, it has been concluded, that all may have contributed to supply the wonders of this species of composition[64]. The northern poetry of the *scalds*[65] appears to have furnished from its cold and gloomy region the malignant spirits, which sent storms to agitate the deep, and pestilence to ravage the land, and the potent spells, which repel violence, or awaken the sleepers of the grave. The oriental fictions with less of terror, have more of variety. In the early *scaldic* odes we find no dragons, giants, magic rings, or enchanted castles, as in the stories of the Arabs[66]; and to the Persian *peris* we must refer the original of the European fairies, which have probably derived also their name from that Persic appellation. These oriental materials of romance[67] are conceived to have been imported into Europe first by the pilgrims, who visited Palestine, and afterwards by the crusaders, especially as the local situation of Armorica or Brittany, in which province they found the earliest and most favourable reception, was not convenient for a communication with the Arabs of Spain. The ancient stories of Greece[68] may

[64] Dunlop's Hist. of Fiction, vol. i. pp. 130, &c. Edinb. 1814.

[65] That romantic fiction had been derived from the *scalds* of the north, was first maintained by Mallet, the historian of Denmark, and afterwards by bishop Percy. That it had been received from the Saracens was suggested by Salmasius, and has been since strongly supported by Warton.—Dunlop, vol. i. pp. 131—135.

[66] A portion of the genuine Arabic romance of *Antar*, composed in the time of Haroun al Raschid, the contemporary of Charlemagne, has been translated by Mr. Terrick Hamilton, and published in the year 1820. In this we can perceive that the Arabs must have derived the machinery and fictions of their later romances from the Persians, for we find in it no genii, magicians, or talismans, or fabulous animals. The wonders are only those of hyperbolical narration.

[67] Dunlop, vol. i. p. 138. [68] Ibid., pp. 140, 142.—Though the classical writers were scarcely known, the fables of the ancient mythology were preserved in a number of popular works. In the thirteenth century many classical stories appeared both in prose, and in metrical form, veiled in the garb of romantic fiction. Of this sort are the Latin works ascribed to Dares Phrygius and Dictys Cretensis concerning the wars of Troy, and the still more ample chronicle of Guido de Colonna, formed from these through the medium of the French metrical work of Benoit de Saint More. These materials were at last wrought into a distinct class of regular romances, professedly composed on classical subjects, which appear to have been first written in the early part of the fifteenth century. Mr.

also have contributed their supplies of fiction, as numerous correspondences have been remarked. The Calypso, or Circe, of Homer may be considered as the prototype of the sorceress, who in romantic tales detains the knight from his quest; the story of Andromeda may have given birth to the fables of damsels rescued by their knights from the jaws of sea-monsters: the celestial armour of the Iliad and the Æneid, the giant Polyphemus and his cave, the griffins guarding mines of gold, the expedition of the golden fleece, the apples and dragon of the Hesperides, the king's daughter an enchantress, who saves her lover; these resemble the embellishments supposed to have been received from the Arabs. The story of the Titans confined by Jupiter in gloomy prisons, as given in the theogony of Hesiod, is more similar to the wild grandeur of the Gothic imagery. It has however been very justly remarked[69], that such fictions were after all but the embellishments of chivalrous adventure, and that this, which was the substantial groundwork, must be sought in the peculiar system of manners, which characterised the age and countries of romance.

Hole in the tale of Sindbad, which he names the Arabian Odyssey' discovers the cave of Polyphemus and the story of the escape of Aristomenes the Messenian.—Remarks on the Arabian Nights' Entertainments, p. 249. London, 1797. The Greeks had also their fictitious narratives, the Milesians, a Greek colony, having first acquired a taste for them from the Persians. Before the age of Alexander however, which introduced a more frequent intercourse between the Greeks and the Asiatics, few attempts were made in this species of composition by the Greeks of Europe. From that time in various ages, the fancy of Greek writers has been indulged in composing tales of imaginary adventures. The most distinguished of these productions was the *Theagenes and Chariclea* of Heliodorus, afterwards bishop of Tricca in Thessaly, who lived about the close of the fourth century; the concluding specimen, which was entitled *Ismene and Ismenias*, was written in the twelfth. In the compositions of Heliodorus and his followers, says Mr. Dunlop, we first perceive woman 'in any degree represented as assuming her proper station of the friend and companion of man.'—History of Fiction, vol. i. pp. 97, 98. The ecclesiastical character of Heliodorus may direct our attention to the true original of this peculiarity, the Christian scriptures, from which the female character has received its importance. 'Indeed,' he has remarked, p. 27, 'in all the ancient romances the heroine is invariably the most interesting and spirited character.'

[69] Ibid. p. 145.

The earliest specimens of this kind of composition being referred to the middle of the twelfth century, before which time the language, in which they were written, had passed into England by the Norman conquest, the court of England, then much more splendid than that of France, was to them the great scene of patronage and encouragement. The first French romances being accordingly composed in England or Normandy, and for the English government, naturally treated of traditions belonging to the people of England. These were supplied by the aboriginal Britons, who readily associated with the Normans, as the conquerors of the Saxons, their ancient adversaries, for which reason also they were acceptable subjects to the new possessors of the government; and, in this manner the adventures of the British Arthur, of which too the French minstrels had before acquired some knowledge in Brittany[70], were celebrated in the original romances, composed in the language of a different country. In the end of the twelfth and the beginning of the thirteenth century, an infinite variety of French metrical romances, on the subject of Arthur and his knights of the round table, appeared in England and Normandy. These were, for the most part, reduced into prose in the course of the thirteenth and the two succeeding centuries[71], and in this form were presented and received, as entitled to the credit of serious history, while the compilers disparaged the metrical originals, that they might recommend their own productions.

When Normandy became again connected with the French government, the native minstrels abandoned the praises of the knights of the round table, and devoted themselves to the celebration of the paladins of Charlemagne. The first work, which furnished materials for these compositions, was the chronicle attributed to Turpin archbishop of Rheims[72], the contemporary of Charlemagne,

[70] The traditions of this first hero of romantic story, had been collected in Brittany by Walter Calenius, or Gualtier, as he is sometimes named, archdeacon of Oxford, and communicated by him to Geoffrey of Monmouth, who founded on them a chronicle of Britain, supposed to have been finished about the year 1140. The oldest of the French metrical romances, which is founded on this chronicle, and entitled *Le Brut*, was written about the year 1155, by Robert Wace, a native of Jersey.—Dunlop, vol. i. pp. 163, &c. [71] Ibid., p. 167.

[72] This chronicle treats of the expedition into Spain, in which

but not really written until the end of the eleventh, or the beginning of the twelfth century; and the earliest of this class of metrical romances appeared in the reign of Louis IX., or about the middle of the thirteenth. The prose compositions of this class were superior to those of the former, as the Saracen adversaries of Charlemagne were a more romantic people than the Saxon enemies of the British hero[73], and afforded an opportunity of introducing tales of eastern magnificence. Their dates cannot be well ascertained, but are supposed not to have been more ancient than the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries[74].

To the northern provinces of France, Le Grand ascribes exclusively the first formation and the ultimate improve-

occurred the celebrated battle of Roncesvalles. [73] Dunlop, vol. i. p. 391. [74] When the subjects afforded by Arthur and Charlemagne had been exhausted, a new series was begun, the hero of the first of which was Amadis de Gaul, an imaginary character. There were also various other classes of fictitious narratives: the classical, composed in the latter part of the fifteenth century; the spiritual, the earliest of which was composed in the year 1529, and the most generally popular, *the Pilgrim's Progress* of Bunyan, after the middle of the seventeenth century; the comic or satirical, the first specimen of which was the work of Rabelais, the most excellent that of Cervantes; the political, as the Utopia of Sir Thomas More, and the Argenis of Barclay; the pastoral, of which the Arcadia of Sir Philip Sidney is to English readers the most interesting example; and the heroic, which in the seventeenth century took the place of the exploded narratives of chivalry. The lofty extravagance, however, of the heroic romance lost its attraction within the same century, in which it had been introduced, and it was succeeded by the modern novels of France and Great Britain, which, with humbler pretensions, are more secure of lasting attention, because more agreeable to the truth of nature.—Dunlop, vol. iii. The Italians, in the mean time, not being a chivalrous people, had adopted, under the guidance of Boccaccio, a lighter species of narrative composition, to which Mr. Dunlop has justly ascribed an important influence, in suggesting to our dramatic poets the combinations of their plots.—Vol. ii. pp. 399, 400. In Italy, morals have been too much corrupted for the feelings, which modern novels represent, the progress of an intrigue being too rapid for the anxieties of passion; and accordingly, as Madame de Staël has remarked in her own novel of Corinne, in a country, in which love occupies so much attention, there is not a single romance. In the British empire, where the comparative purity of morals supports the sentiment of passion, this sort of composition has become a trade, from which a constant supply is furnished for the occupation of the idle, and the relaxation of the busy; a trade, indeed, latterly ennobled by the genius of Scott.

ment of the French theatre[75], their romances and tales of the thirteenth century having prepared the way for the mysteries, moralities, and farces, of the succeeding ages, and the eminent men, who afterwards carried the French drama to its highest perfection, Molière, Racine, and Voltaire, having been born in these very countries. To the *troubadours*, or the poets of southern France, the dramatic art was always unknown[76], nor were their lyric compositions ever connected with the recital of a story.

The *troubadours*, living in the provinces adjacent to Spain, were much more largely indebted to the Arabs of that country, than the *trouveurs* of northern France. The literature, which they thus received, was exclusively oriental, unlike the science of the Arabs, much of which had been by them derived from the Greeks. To the literature of Greece the Arabs remained almost wholly strangers. Homer, though, translated into Syriac in the reign of Haroun al Raschid, was never introduced into the language of Arabia[77]. No Grecian poet, indeed, no orator, and except Plutarch, no historian, was ever added to the literature of this refined and inquisitive people. It has been supposed that the alienation of the Arabs from the classic compositions of Greece was caused by the horror, with which they regarded the pagan idolatry of that country. But, besides that this objection would not extend to the orators and historians, it has been remarked, that the horror of idolatry neither hindered them from preserving the memorials of that, which had subsisted in their original country before the time of Mohammed, nor from studying the idolatrous religion of Hindostan, when they, in the course of their conquests, had become its masters. M. Langlés has concluded, that the neglect of Grecian literature arose from the absolute impossibility of attaining any knowledge of it, all the Arabian translations of Grecian originals having been made from very imperfect Syrian versions. It is certain that its chastened beauties could never have been rendered attractive to the unrestrained imagination of the orientals, which delighted in a luxuriance of metaphor, and

[75] Fabliaux, &c., tome i. pref. pp. liv. lv.: tome ii. pp. 74, 75.
[76] Hist. Litt. des Troubadours, tome i. p. 443. [77] Hist. Litt. d'Italie, par Ginguené, tome i. p. 211.

would have regarded the most figurative of the Grecian writings as tame and uninteresting. Whatever may have been the cause, the effect, as M. Ginguené has well observed, was that the literature of the Arabs preserved its appropriate character, its genuine beauties and its blemishes, instead of becoming a Grecian literature, disguised in a different and unsuitable language.

Though the Arabs indulged a passion for narratives of marvellous adventures, which seem to have largely contributed to the production of the romances of northern France, and of the English court, and possessed various heroic poems, designed to commemorate the actions of their distinguished men, yet the predominant character of their poetry seems to be that of lyric composition[78]. Their poems of this description have been chiefly of two sorts, distinguished by the names *gazal* and *cassidah*[79], the former of which did not exceed seventeen or eighteen distichs, the latter contained not fewer than thirty. The *gazal*, which is of a light and Anacreontic class, belonged rather to the Persians[80], the *cassidah*, which is of an elegiac nature, though most usually applied to amorous subjects, was preferred by the Arabs.

That the poetry of the Arabs of Spain served to excite and direct the poetical efforts of the neighbouring provinces of France, is not merely inferred from the vicinity, which facilitated the communication between the two countries, but is also confirmed by some historical circumstances. In the year 1085, the king of Castile[81], who had married a French woman, daughter of the duke of Burgundy, invited many lords of France to assist him in his war with the infidels, and with their assistance he reduced under his government Toledo, which was celebrated for its schools. After the conquest, great numbers of the French auxiliaries established themselves in the city, which they had assisted in acquiring, while the conquered Arabs remained there, retaining their national manners and usages, and consequently the songs, in which they found so much gratification. In this manner was a direct communication opened between the minstrels of the Arabs and the coun-

[78] Sismondi de la Litt. du Midi de l'Europe, tome i. p. 60. Paris, 1813. [79] D'Herbelot, art. *Gazal* et *Cassidah*. [80] Ginguené, tome i. p. 224. [81] Ibid., p. 248.

trymen of the *troubadours;* and, as the first of these poets[82], who is known to us, was born in the year 1071, or but fourteen years before the reduction of Toledo, it appears that the commencement of the poetry of the southern provinces of France may be strictly referred to the influence of the songs of the Arabs upon a people devoted, like themselves, to gay enjoyment[83].

Though the poetry of the *troubadours* has been commonly distinguished by the name of Provençal, it was much more cultivated in Languedoc than in the province properly named Provence[84], and Toulouse was regarded as its principal seat. This city seems, indeed, to have been, in all ages, a favourite abode of the Muses[85]. Martial has, in one of his epigrams, characterised Toulouse by the title of *Palladian*, for its superior love of letters. Ausonius, a celebrated poet of the fourth century, was educated there, and tells us that the most distinguished families of the empire, and even the emperors themselves, sent their children to that city for instruction; and, when the successive invasions of the people of the north and of the south had ceased to disturb its repose, the genius of the place again manifested its intellectual influence in the superior cultivation of that early poetry, which has been transformed into the living poetry of the modern nations of Europe. Such was the province, which had been placed in the immediate vicinity of the Spanish peninsula, as if to receive, in the most favourable circumstances, the germs of Arabian imagination.

[82] Hist. Litt. des Troubadours, tome i. p. 2. [83] The people of these provinces erected among themselves a singular tribunal, named *the court of love*, for deciding the controversies occasioned by the subtleties of amorous casuistry, and formed from its determinations the system, which they denominated the gay science, *gai saber*. — Le Grand, tome i. pref. p. 57. They disputed, for example, which of two lovers manifests more passion, he who is so jealous, that he is alarmed at every occurrence, or he who is so prepossessed in favour of his mistress, that he cannot perceive, that he has good cause for jealousy. — Mémoires pour la Vie de Pétrarque, tome ii. notes, p. 59. [84] Ibid., tome i. p. 153. The original name of the southern dialect of France, *langue-d'oc*, was changed into *provençal*, the name of Provence having been widely extended through the southern parts of France, when a count of the district properly so named, had possessed himself of many neighbouring territories. [85] Ibid., p. 152.

The *troubadours*, who began to compose their poems near the close of the eleventh century, flourished during the two, which next succeeded. In this interval[86], persons of every rank, sex, profession, and character, applied themselves with ardour to the cultivation of the new poetry; sovereigns, lords, ladies, ecclesiastics, monks, even an inquisitor, libertines, and devotees. Their compositions were of various descriptions. Far the greater portion was employed in celebrating that spirit of gallantry, which was a principal part of the new-formed system of chivalrous manners; and the *troubadours* thus contributed in their turn to support an institution, from which they were supplied with their most usual and most interesting topic[87]. They also wrote poems historical, satirical, and didactic; and some[88], named *tensons*, consisting of alternate couplets, and displaying the powers of contending bards. Pastorals they attempted, but with little success. Theirs was the poetry of courts, and they had little opportunity of admiring and feeling the beauties of nature. The encouragement, which they received, was great and universal, and the new school of poetry became widely extended; in Italy, in Spain, in England, and even in Germany, says their historian[89], men roused themselves to give attention to these Amphions, attempted to imitate them in the same language, and then laboured, after their example, to improve the languages of their respective countries.

In this original school of modern poetry, rhyme was substituted for the measured quantity of the classic versification, and has continued generally to characterise the poetry of the modern languages of Europe[90]. Whence this other

[86] Hist. Litt. des Troubadours, disc. prel. p. 15, tome ii. p. 42.

[87] That the general character of the ancient poetry was of a very different kind, is attested by Lucian, in the dialogue, in which Venus demands of her son, why he had not directed his arrows against the Muses. They, he replies, are venerable, and always thoughtful, and occupied with their music.

[88] In these they maintained opposite sentiments, almost always on subjects of gallantry, often extremely licentious.— Hist. Litt. des Troubadours, disc. prel. pp. 67, 68.

[89] Ibid., p. 71.

[90] The first rude efforts of the English drama were made in rhyme; but the tragedy of Ferrex and Porrex, first performed in the year 1561, set an example of blank verse, which, notwithstanding the rhyming tragedies of Dryden, has been happily established as the proper poetry

character of poetry has been primarily derived, is, however, a subject of even more various discussion than the origin of romantic fiction. Some have contended, that it arose in the degeneracy of the Latin poetry[91], alleging that gradually, as poetic quantity was disregarded and for-

of dramatic dialogue. Milton, too, in his greater poems, emancipated himself from the restraint of this species of versification, and in our own days, he has been followed by Cowper and by Southey. But rhyme, which Madame de Staël has fancifully named *the image of hope and of remembrance*, has, however, continued to constitute the general characteristic of all our poetry, except that of the drama. In the languages of France and Italy, attempts were also made to sustain poetry without the aid of rhyme, but with little success, except so far as the dramas of Alfieri in the latter country, which yet seem to owe their estimation rather to a political feeling, than to their dramatic merit, may have furnished more favourable examples. It was natural that the restoration of the ancient literature should dispose men to seek in modern languages the same resources of harmony, by which the poetry of Greece and Rome had been maintained. We have, accordingly, in the *Arcadia* of Sir Philip Sidney, says Mr. Dunlop, vol. iii. pp. 174, 175, hexameters, or at least, what seem intended by the author as such, elegiacs, Sapphics, Anacreontics, Phaleusiacs, Asclepiades, and in short, every thing but poetry. Similar attempts have been made, with as little advantage, in the French, Italian, and Spanish languages, though in France an academy had been formed, composed partly of musicians, for the purpose of ascertaining with accuracy the measures of poetry.—Baillet sur les Poetes. The German language alone has, like those of ancient Greece and Italy, long and short syllables; and Klopstock, whose *Messiah* constitutes the poetical epoch of Germany, has accordingly constructed his verses of the hexameters and the iambics of ancient poetry.—Allemagne, par Mad. de Staël, tome i. pp. 271, 279. Madame de Staël, however, has remarked, that quantity in the German language is determined solely by a grammatical consideration, the radical syllable being long, and the accessaries short; and that this arrangement, not being regulated by the harmony of sound, must be less suitable to the purposes of poetry, than that of the classic languages.—Ibid., p. 270. The attempt of Klopstock appears to have failed, for Schlegel has pronounced it to have been the great cause of the unpopularity of his poem.—Lect. on Literature, vol. ii. p. 269. In modern languages, generally, accentuation has been substituted for quantity.

[91] We do not find in the poetry of Greece any instances of rhyming verses, which may not be supposed to have been merely accidental; but in that of ancient Rome, particularly in elegiac composition, they must be thought to have been sometimes designedly introduced as ornaments.—Cicero, Tusc. Disput., lib. i. cap. 28, 35, has cited even from Ennius two remarkable triplets of rhyming verses.

gotten, rhyme was substituted in its place. Others have conceived, that the first rhymers were the *Runic* bards of the north of Europe, these having been the teachers of the monkish rhymers of the Latin language. Others maintain, that the practice of seeking poetic harmony in the similarity of termination, was a part of that forming influence, which was exercised by the Arabs on the poetry of modern Europe, and was received by the monkish writers of Latin verses from those who composed in the vernacular languages. Lastly, doctor O'Conor has argued[92], that to compose in rhyme was a Celtic practice, transmitted from Ireland to the Saxon clergy of England and the ecclesiastics of the continent, and by them conveyed to the poets of the modern dialects.

From this enumeration of opinions it appears, that rhyme has been very generally employed to distinguish poetry from prose[93]. Measured quantity, a more perfect music of speech, seems to have been a character of the noble language of Greece, and to have belonged to the Latin language, only as it was a ruder dialect of the former[94].

[92] The use of rhyme among the ancient Irish, Doctor O'Conor attributed to the prevailing practice of accompanying songs with the music of the harp, the rhyme according most distinctly with the instrumental music.—Proleg., part ii. p. 72. For this practice, as well as for their musical skill, he has quoted various decisive authorities.—Ibid., p. 73. The first of the Anglo-Saxons, who composed Latin verses in rhyme, was Aldhelm, who had been educated by Maildulphus, an Irishman.—Ibid., p. 68. So far then as this practice was received on the continent from the Anglo-Saxons, it must be primarily ascribed to the Irish. It appears to have been introduced at Rome about the year 384, by pope Damasus, who was a Spaniard.—Ibid., part i. p. 96. This may prove it to have had there a Celtic, though not an Irish origin. The Leonine verses, afterwards introduced, combined poetic quantity with rhyme. Those of Gulielmus Pictaviensis, mentioned by Usher, in his Sylloge, Epist. xxix., are among the earliest specimens of this kind of versification now extant. The name is supposed to have been derived from a Parisian monk of the twelfth century; but these rhymes are much more ancient, and he could only have perfected the invention.—Ginguené, tome i. p. 253.

[93] Of all modern languages, the English appears to be best fitted to produce a pleasing effect by its rhymes, as it abounds in monosyllables, which distinctly mark the correspondences of sound, and present them to the ear single and unmixed.

[94] Such is the opinion of Zeunius, in his Introd. in Ling. Latin, cap. i. sect. i. The origin of the Latin language he refers to the

Those nations, which did not possess an instrument of so much compass, were forced to seek their gratification in the more simple expedient of corresponding closes, trusting to accentuation for the general music of their lines. The bards of Iceland[95], indeed, disqualified perhaps by the influence of a severe climate for producing harmony of either kind, appear to have devised a most complicated alliteration, rather as an exercise of ingenuity in difficult composition, than as a contrivance for affording pleasure to the ear. The bards of the Hebrews also, at least so far as we can now judge of their compositions, appear to have disregarded both quantity and rhyme[96], and to have sought no other characters of poetry, than an elevation of expression with a solemn correspondence of the sentiment

Pelasgians, the earliest inhabitants both of Greece and Italy.—Ibid., sect. ii. Agreeably to this opinion, Tacitus has remarked, forma literis Latinis, quæ veterrimis Græcorum.—Annal. ii. cap. xiv. It is strongly confirmed by a passage of Suetonius, de Illustr. Gram., cap. i., in which Livius Andronicus and Ennius, the most ancient of the Latin writers, are called Semi-Grecians. But how much the Latin language, even in its maturity, was felt to be inferior to the parent language of Greece, appears from the following testimony of Quintilian: tanto est sermo Græcus Latino jucundior, ut nostri poetæ, quoties dulce carmen esse voluerunt, illorum id nominibus exornent.—Inst. Orator., lib. xii. cap. x. sect. ii. Of measured quantity perhaps it may be said, that it can well exist only in a language, which admits much freedom of transposition in the collocation of words, and that this can be admitted only where a very detailed system of inflections indicates amidst transposition the relations of grammatical construction. [95] Letters on Iceland, by Dr. Uno Von Troil, letter xvii. Lond. 1780. [96] Lowth, though he contends that Hebrew poetry must have been in some degree metrical, since we observe, in many instances, that the initial letters correspond to the order of the alphabet, and also, since the forms of words employed in it are altered from those of ordinary language, admits that not only the quantity, but even the number of syllables, cannot be precisely determined.—De Sacrâ Poesi Hebr. Præl., iii. The same writer has remarked, that the peculiar structure of Hebrew poetry accommodates it in such a manner to the expression of the sentiment, each poem being commonly divided into equal periods, and each period into its corresponding members, that it is fitted for translation much beyond the measured, but varied quantity, of the poetry of Greece and Rome, because the forms of the sentences, remaining unaltered in translation, preserve much of their original grandeur. Is not this a peculiar adaptation in compositions, with which the unlearned of all nations should have the opportunity of becoming familiar?

in a parallelism of choral chant. Their poetry however was the language of divine inspiration, and perhaps could not submit to the technical combinations of merely human composition. Among the Saxons too we are unable to discover any of the distinctive characters of poetry[97], possibly because, in their extreme rudeness of manners, they had not been able to invent any other mode of peculiarly affecting the ear, than the quick return of pauses in their diminutive verses. With these exceptions, belonging to special cases, it seems that poetry must seek to please the organ of hearing either by measured quantity, or by rhyme. Music is properly the language of sentiment or feeling, as speech is the language of ideas; and it is the nature of poetry, as a more elevated speech, to effect some combination or other of the two species of language, and to delight us by their united expression. But, however general the practice of rhyming may have been, the *troubadours*[98] seem to have received it from the Arabs, for the communication between the two classes of poets is sufficiently discoverable, the example of the Arabian songs was much more attractive than that of the rhymes of monkish Latin, and the taste of the French poets for the combination of poetry with vocal and instrumental music, appears to have been formed by an intimation of that lively and poetical people.

The influence of the poetry of the *troubadours* on the poetry of England has been noticed by Dryden[99], in observing that Chaucer availed himself of the stores supplied by their language, to enrich that of his own country, until his time remarkable for its poverty. But the important influence of the poetry of the south of France was exercised in the formation of that of Italy. The court of Sicily, it has been already remarked, first drew forth by its fostering encouragement the genius of Italian poetry, so that, in the time of Dante, the literature of Italy bore

[97] Turner's Hist. of the Anglo-Saxons, vol. iv. book vi. ch. v. Sir W. Scott says on this subject, 'rhyme they had none; their rhythm seems to have been uncertain; and perhaps their whole poetry consisted in the adaptation of the words to some simple tune.'—Rev. of Ellice's Spec. of the Early Eng. Poets in his Misc. Prose Works, vol. xvii., p. 5. Edinb. 1835. [98] Ginguené, tome i. p. 256.

[99] Pref. to his Fables, p. 208. Dryden's Works, vol. ii. Lond. 1808.

the name of Sicilian[100]. Of the poets of this Sicilian school it has been observed, that their language is compounded of the dialects of Sicily and Provence[101], and that those of their poems, which are named *canzoni*, have almost all the same form, which had been given by the *troubadours*[102], while their sonnets, probably Sicilian in their origin, have a distinct one, which has been retained in the Italian poetry[103]. The example of the Sicilian court was soon followed in the adjacent peninsula[104], many poets appearing in its northern provinces before the middle of the thirteenth century. Two of these, both named Guido, have been distinguished above the rest, one for having received such a testimony of the admiration of Dante, that he has been, though erroneously, supposed to have been tutor to that great poet, the other for having determined by more precise regulations the form of the Italian sonnet, in which preceding poets had indulged some caprice.

The poetry of these Italians, like that of the Sicilians, bears the character of the strains of the *troubadours*, with this inferiority, however, common to both[105], that, though the poets of Provence, like those of the Arabs, applied their genius to a variety of subjects, to the achievements of war in particular, and the pleasures of life, together with the adventures of love, and were sometimes adulatory, sometimes satirical, and at other times the relaters of licentious, but pointed stories, the Sicilians and Italians confined themselves to the single topic of the amorous passion, which they diversified by subtle refinements and exaggerations, until they lost all the truth and impressiveness of natural sentiment. In the following age, indeed, Dante and Petrarch presented to their countrymen the

[100] Ginguené, tome i. p. 395. [101] Ibid., p. 396. [102] To the *trovbadours* is to be ascribed almost all the variety of measures employed in modern poetry, for the structure of the odes of the Persians and the Arabs is simple and uniform.—Ibid., pp. 286, 287. The forms of the *canzos* of the *troubadours* were extremely varied; and the Italians in their *canzoni* imitated those more especially, the strophes of which contained the greatest number of verses.—Ibid., p. 295. [103] The rigorous laws of the sonnet are specified by Boileau, L'Art Poetique, chant ii. l. 82, &c. [104] Ginguené, tome i. pp. 409, &c. [105] Ibid., pp. 433, 434.

models of a juster poetry, but these great writers did not disown the debt of gratitude, which they owed to their predecessors, and one of the *troubadours* has been celebrated by them both for his excellence in amatory composition[106]. Nor is it surprising that the influence of the poets of the southern provinces of France should have been thus considerable in Italy, as their language and that of Italy had a sensible affinity[107], and the crusades had established a frequent and intimate communication between the two countries.

It is universally admitted, even by the writer of their literary history[108], that few traces of genius are discoverable in the compositions of this class of poets; and we can only say of them, that they awakened the genius of those, by whom they were succeeded. The cause intimated by the historian[109] is the want of the classic models of antiquity, a want not experienced by their successors in Italy. This, indeed, will in some measure account for their deficiency, but it does not seem at all adequate to its entire explanation, for we might still hope to find the energies of native genius, irregular and extravagant, yet original and interesting. The grand cause appears to have been, that they were the poets of an artificial system of society and manners. Living in the baronial courts of France, and witnessing only the factitious manners of chivalry, they could not feel the inspiration of that simple nature, which they never beheld. There however they were favourably situated for giving the first refinement to the barbarism of modern language, and attracting attention to vernacular composition. Their ignorance, too, of the classical productions of Greece and Rome was indispensable for preserving them from the strong temptation to devote themselves to the study and practice of the rich and regular languages, in which these were composed. Even the mediocrity of their pretensions may fairly be considered, as conducive to the ultimate improvement of European litera-

[106] Hist. Litt. des Troubadours, tome ii. pp. 479, 480. Petrarch began a residence in Toulouse only six years after the floral games had been established there, to reanimate the genius of the poets of the province.—Mém. pour la Vie de Pétrarque, tome i. pp. 154, 155.

[107] Hist. Litt. des Troubadours, tome ii. p. 344. [108] Ibid., disc. prél. p. liv.; tome i. p. 468. [109] Ibid., tome i. p. 415.

ture. A late writer has observed, that, as the *troubadours* had established, from the one end of Europe to the other, a common dialect, if any man of superior genius had arisen among them, this dialect might probably have become the general language of Europe, at least it might have continued to be, for a considerable time, the general language of poetry[110]. A *troubadour* of merit, equal to that of the great masters of Italian poetry, might thus have fixed the poetry of the middle age to the dialect of Provence, and have obstructed the various and emulous improvement of the diversified languages, which were just then beginning to be considered as capable of expressing the ideas and feelings of the educated classes of society. The mediocrity of these poets was sufficient for animating the first aspirings of awakened genius, but was not competent to procure for the language, in which they wrote, an exclusive regard.

Two causes co-operated with the mediocrity of these early poets, to secure the other dialects of Europe from the danger of a powerful and overbearing competition; these were the political situation of the southern provinces of France, and the degradation of the characters of their poets. In the earlier part of the thirteenth century, these provinces became the scene of a violent persecution of the early separatists from the church of Rome, and the birthplace of the inquisition; and in its latter part Charles of Anjou, the heir of the house of Provence, possessed himself of Naples, and drew the Provençal lords to his Italian court. The great encouragement originally given to the *troubadours* had, on the other hand, brought forward such a crowd of disorderly pretenders, that, in the fourteenth century, the whole tribe sunk into neglect and oblivion[111].

[110] Introd. to the Lit. Hist. of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Cent., p. 179. [111] Hist. Litt. des Troubadours, disc. prel. pp. lxxix. lxxx.

BOOK II.

REVIEW OF MODERN HISTORY FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY TO THE REFORMATION.

CHAPTER I.

Of the history of Italy and Sicily from the establishment of the papal see at Avignon, in the year 1309, *to the commencement of the papacy of Leo X. in the year* 1513.

Negotiations for a *balance of power* in Italy occasioned by the expedition of the German emperor Henry VII. in the year 1312—Decay of the kingdom of Naples begun, 1343—Efforts of Florence provoked by the aggrandisement of Milan, 1369—Territorial aggrandisement of Venice in Italy, 1406—Rise of the Medici in Florence, 1421—French dynasty of Naples superseded by the Spanish dynasty of Sicily, 1442—Treaty negotiated by Lorenzo de' Medici against Venice, for maintaining a permanent *balance of power* in Italy, 1480—Death of Lorenzo, 1492—Invasion of Charles VIII. of France, 1494—Invasion of Louis XII. of France, 1499—Naples and Sicily united under the Spanish family of Sicily, 1503—League of Cambrai formed against Venice, 1508—Government of Rienzi in Rome, 1347—The papacy restored to Rome, 1376—The great schism begun, 1378—terminated, 1429—Power of the papacy restored by the popes Alexander VI. and Julius II.—The papacy alienated from France.

It has been remarked, in the beginning of the fifteenth chapter of the preceding book, that two distinct operations of policy appear to have been carried on among the states of Europe, for the ultimate establishment of a system of federative connexion. One of these consisted in the mutual agency of Germany and Italy, connected as they were by

the conflicting pretensions of the German sovereigns and of the Roman pontiffs. The consideration of this process is now to be resumed, and it will be shown in the present chapter, that, in the interval interposed between the commencement of the fourteenth century and that of the pontificate of Leo X., a federative arrangement of policy was actually devised, and for a short time maintained in Italy, and that events then occurred, tending to extend to France and Germany the combinations of such an arrangement.

The existence of the singular authority, exercised by the papal see, required, as has been before remarked, that the country, in which it should be established, should be so divided between rival powers, that none should be found capable of repressing the pretensions of the ecclesiastical principality. Some kind of balance of political interests was therefore generally the condition of Italy from the commencement of the kingdom of the Lombards, when the peninsula was divided between that people and the subjects of the eastern empire, and the papal power first began to assert its importance. When the Lombards had been overthrown by Charlemagne, and a new empire, comprehending the papacy, was established in the west, the balance of Italian interests still continued to be maintained by the Greek empire. When again the imperial dignity had been transferred from France to Germany, and this other power was pressing hard upon the papacy, a special support was provided for the ecclesiastical principality by the establishment of the Normans in the south of Italy. Though such a struggle was very different from a regulated system of equilibrium among numerous governments, it was yet preparatory to the formation of such a system, as it tended to dispose the several governments of Italy to seek support in their mutual connexions.

The two powers, which led in the great struggle of the Italian parties, respectively attached to the interests of the emperor and the pontiff, were at length successively removed from the field of contention, when these parties had been sufficiently matured, and were able to continue it without their superintendence. The authority of the empire in Italy was annihilated at the death of the emperor Frederic II., which occurred in the year 1250. The papal

see was established at Avignon in the year 1309[1], a Frenchman, who assumed on his advancement the name of Clement V., having been elected to the papacy. The pontiffs were again established in Rome after the lapse of sixty-eight years; but the great schism[2], begun in the following year, was concluded only in the year 1429, when it had during fifty-one years continued to paralyse the efforts of the church. The numerous governments of Italy were thus abandoned to the promiscuous struggle, which necessarily exercise the forces of so many independent communities, habituated to contention, placed in a close vicinage, and consequently engaged in frequent hostility. In such circumstances it was natural that an anxious desire should prevail, that no state should be permitted to extend its dominion over others, and that preventive measures should be employed for securing the safety of each by the stipulated obligations of a confederacy. It was accordingly in these circumstances that the plan of establishing a regular balance of power was first devised and reduced to practice[3].

[1] Avignon, was in the year 1663 seized by Louis XIV., when he had quarrelled with the pope, but was restored in the following year on the submission of the pontiff; it was again seized by the same king in the year 1688 on occasion of another dispute, and was again restored in the year 1690, since which time it continued to belong to the papacy, until it was occupied by the French in the war of the revolution. [2] This schism in the papacy was a result partly of its long establishment in Avignon, but chiefly of the conduct of the pontiff first elected after the restoration. The people of Rome, apprehensive of the election of a Frenchman, as it might occasion another removal of the papacy, compelled the cardinals to elect a Neapolitan, who assumed the name of Urban VI. His advancement was during three months acknowledged even by six cardinals, who had remained at Avignon. At the end of that time however his arrogance drove these to a new election, when they chose Robert count of Geneva, who adopting the name of Clement VII., fixed his residence in Avignon. This pontiff was acknowledged by France, Spain, Scotland, Sicily, and Cyprus; the former by the remaining countries of Europe. —Mosh., cent. xiv. part ii. ch. ii. sect. xiv. Hist. des Papes, tome iii. p. 526. [3] Hume has justly contended that the principles of this system were not unknown to the ancients, and are especially conspicuous in the history of the Grecian states, remarking that the oration of Demosthenes for the Megalopolitans displays its utmost refinement.—Essay on the Balance of Power. Robertson on the other hand has referred its origin to the invasion of Italy by Charles of France, and the consequent hostilities of his successor Louis XII.

But, however obvious such an arrangement may now be deemed to have been in the circumstances, which have been described, it was so far from being a necessary result even of these circumstances, that a particular state seems to have been provided for forming the plan, and various external agencies for bringing that state into the required activity.

In a central part of the peninsula, where it must have been subjected to the influence of every change in the other governments of Italy, a state was formed, sufficiently powerful[4] for exercising a control over the movements of the rest, and so strongly animated with the spirit of liberty, that it was capable of being excited to the most strenuous exertion for securing its independence. This state was Florence, the same which has been distinguished by its industry and its elegance, and it has thus established a triple claim to the gratitude of posterity.

Early in the fourteenth century this active and reflecting republic, the Athens of modern Italy[5], was induced to

—Hist. of Charles V., vol. i. sect. xi. Mr. Brougham agrees with Hume in admitting, that the elements of the theory were known to the ancients, but considers as its grand characteristic the systematic form, to which it has been reduced in modern times, and chiefly the universal recognition of the right of mutual inspection through the intervention of authorised residents.—Colonial Policy, book iii. sect. i. Hume indeed himself has elsewhere remarked, that the balance of power was a secret in politics fully known only to the present age.—Essay on Civil Liberty.

[4] About the year 1337 the number of men fit for military service in the Florentine territory was reckoned to amount to eighty thousand, but they extended the military age from fifteen to seventy years. But the battles of Florence were fought by her mercenaries, and the revenue, with which she hired these troops, is stated by Sismondi to have been greater than that of the king of Sicily and Aragon, and even than that of the king of Naples, exceeding three hundred thousand florins.—Hist. des Rép. Ital., tome v. p. 364, &c. The military force of the republic is represented by Mr. Roscoe to have seldom exceeded five thousand men.—Life of Lorenzo de' Medici, vol. ii. p. 27. Lond. 1797. The domestic force seems here to be understood. Sismondi remarks that the Florentines, though eminent in political, were deficient in military fortitude.—Hist. des Rép. Ital. tome iv. p. 335. This character was well suited to the support of a system of precautionary policy, which proposed no conquest.

[5] Sismondi, comparing modern Italy with ancient Greece, remarks that Athens revived in Florence, Sparta in Venice; that Lucca and

make extraordinary efforts[6] for the protection of the Guelfs, or anti-imperial party, and with this view to embrace in its negotiations the whole of Italy, with even the courts of Avignon and France. The German emperor Henry VII., while the papacy was exiled at Avignon, entered Italy to receive the imperial crown, and so much revived by this expedition, the spirits of the Ghibelins or imperialists, that the utmost energy of their adversaries was required for resisting their violence. The resistance[7] would probably have been ineffectual, if the death of the emperor, so unexpected that it was attributed to poison, had not delivered them from the danger, and restored the balance of Italy. Thus suddenly arrested, the expedition of the emperor[8] served just to call forth the exertion of this active and politic people. The year 1312, in which this first effort was made by the Florentines, was accordingly the epoch, though not of a regular balance of power, yet of the negotiations, by which such a system was finally established.

From the year 1328[9] the Florentines were excited by a new alarm to assume the formal guardianship of Italian independence. Castruccio Castricani, the lord of the adjacent state of Lucca, who possessed all the qualities[10], which could accomplish the tyrant of a republic, encouraged Louis V. of Germany[11], the successor of Henry VII., to enter Italy in hostility to the party of the pope, by whom his election had been vehemently opposed. That chieftain

her Castruccio recalled, though with much inferior virtue, Thebes and her Epaminondas; that Pisa and Sienna might be compared with Megara and Corinth, Genoa with Syracuse, while the fertile country of Lombardy, like the colonies of lesser Asia, had submitted to the dominion of rulers, always regarded as tyrants.—Ibid., tome vi. p. 177. [6] Ibid., tome iv. p. 333. [7] Ibid., p. 345. [8] His reign is also remarkable for having laid the foundations of the petty sovereignties afterwards constituted in Italy, by establishing hereditary governors in the principal cities.—Pfeffel, tome i. p. 474.

[9] Hist. des Rep. Ital. tome v. pp. 169, 176. [10] Et quidem is erat Castruccius, ut quoniam ita ferebant tempora, nullius manu libertas honestius periret.—Beverini Annales Luccens., lib. vi. p. 742, apud Sismondi, Hist. des Rép. Ital., tome v. p. 162. This chieftain was lord of Pisa, Lucca, Pistoria, Lunigiana, a great part of the eastern coast of Genoa, and more than three hundred fortified castles.—Ibid., p. 160. [11] Ibid., p. 144.

had been already engaged in a disadvantageous war with the Florentines, supported by the power of Naples; and he sought the assistance of the German monarch, that he might acquire a superiority over his enemies. From the imminent danger of this confederacy the Florentines were relieved by the death of Castruccio, but from that time they constituted it the system of their policy to prevent the recurrence of a danger so alarming.

A permanent object of this preventive policy was provided in the aggrandisement of Milan. In the year 1339 Visconti, the lord of Milan, was sovereign of ten cities of Lombardy[12], and also enjoyed a share of the lordship of Pavia. Possessed of so much dominion in this part of Italy, he was impelled, in the natural progress of ambition, to seek other acquisitions in Tuscany, when the death of an aunt gave him a domestic claim to an inheritance in Pisa. Though the hand of death arrested this chief in the midst of his projects, a connexion had been formed between his family and the people of Pisa, which brought their power into the vicinity of Florence.

Of the two parties of the Ghibelins and Guelfs neither had been[13], in the beginning of their struggles, more favourable to freedom than the other, either cause having been indiscriminately embraced by tyrants and republics. But, when the family of Visconti had risen to power, they favoured at once the Ghibelins and the usurpers, and thus confounded that party with the cause of the Italian princes. When therefore a Guelf had possessed himself of a government, he became a Ghibelin to secure the protection of the lord of Milan; and when a Ghibelin city had shaken off the yoke of its prince, it sought in the like manner the assistance of Florence, by espousing the party

[12] Milan, Como, Vercelli, Lodi, Placentia, Cremona, Cremo, Borgo San Donnino, Bergamo, and Brescia.—Hist. des Rép. Ital., tome v. p. 285. Otho, archbishop of Milan, had laid the foundation of this signiory towards the end of the thirteenth century, having at his death, which occurred in the year 1295, transmitted his power to his nephew. This dynasty enjoyed the extraordinary advantage of furnishing six successive chiefs all eminent for ability. The last of these six, who died in the year 1354, had subjected Genoa, Bologna, and almost all Lombardy, and had attempted Tuscany, and the State of the Church.—Ibid., tome viii. pp. 23, 24. [13] Ibid., tome vi. p. 339.

of the Guelfs. Thus that which originally had been the cause of the papal see, as opposed to the empire, was transformed into the cause of liberty, as opposed to despotism; and the external policy of the Florentine republic, dictated by the necessity of its situation, was assimilated to the principle of its interior administration, which carried civil liberty to a feverish inquietude[14]. The struggle of Florence against Milan was consequently not the mere result of a cold calculation of policy, but was excited by an ardent enthusiasm for that republican freedom, which was the idol of the affections of its citizens.

The Neapolitan government, to which the Florentines had hitherto looked for protection, sunk at this time into decay, and left them to maintain the struggle alone. So important to them had been the protection of that kingdom, that they had deemed it prudent to grant the lordship of their city for five years to Robert king of Naples[15], when the emperor Henry VII. had entered Italy; and again, when they were severely pressed by Castruccio Castracani, they judged it expedient to seek refuge under the power of the same prince, by granting the same dignity for ten years to his son the duke of Calabria[16]. From the danger of this latter concession they were indeed very critically delivered by the death of the duke, as they had been before by the stroke of mortality rescued from the hostility, first of the emperor Henry VII., and then of Castruccio. The death of the duke, the sole male descendant of the king of Naples, had another very important operation, in abandoning the succession to a female, Joanna I., whose weakness and misconduct dishonoured the throne, and destroyed the prosperity and power of the kingdom. Robert died in the year 1343, and by his death[17] exposed the kingdom to a renewal of those agitations, which had been repressed by the princes of the family of Anjou.

The Florentines were, in the year 1369, provoked by the

[14] Such is the allusion of Dante, Purg., cant. vi.:—

E se ben ti ricordi, e vedi lume,
Vedrai te somigliante a quella inferma,
Che non può trovar posa in sù le piume,
Ma con dar volta suo dolore scherma.

[15] Hist. des Rép. Ital., tome iv. p. 345. [16] Ibid., tome v. p. 132.
[17] Ibid., p. 387.

Visconti to engage in a confederacy against them[18]; and, though the war was terminated in the following year, it had the effect of establishing a union among the three republics of Florence, Pisa, and Lucca, and thus of giving to the first the disposal of the forces of Tuscany. A contest of a longer duration, and of a different issue, was begun in the year 1392[19]. This was vigorously maintained during ten years, in which time Florence saw herself forsaken by every ally except the lord of Padua, the duke of Milan extending his conquests round her territory[20]; and at length an attempt was made by this prince to cut off her communication with the sea[21], and thus to dry up the channel of her prosperity. The strength of Florence was not sufficient for averting the impending ruin, but again on this occasion was she rescued from ruin by the unexpected decease of her enemy. From the struggle she had received a salutary admonition, for she was taught to seek additional resources in more extended combinations of policy.

The attempt made by the duke of Milan, to intercept the communication of Florence with the sea, appears to have prompted its people to depart from the generous policy, which they alone had embraced, and observed for a century, and to engage in a war of acquisition. In the year 1405 they purchased from one of the Visconti the lordship of the important city of Pisa[22], and then engaged in a war with the inhabitants to overcome their resistance, Pisa was reduced in the following year, but ruined in the

[18] Hist. des Rép. Ital., tome vii. pp. 55, 61. [19] Ibid., pp. 343, 410, 449, 450 [20] The title of duke was sold to John Galeaz in the year 1395, by the emperor Wenceslaus, and the Visconti thus became the acknowledged and legitimate rulers of Milan and its dependent territory. The appointment so made constituted the foundation of the opposite claims of the king of France and the emperor to the duchy of Milan, when the male posterity of John Galeaz had become extinct, the king of France claiming in right of a descent from his daughter, and the emperor as sovereign of a fief, which had lapsed to the empire.—Ibid., pp. 359—361. [21] The Florentines, no longer admitted into the ports of Pisa, or of the state of Sienna, were reduced to that of Motroné, near Pietra-Santa, in Lunigiana. From this port the route passed through the state of Lucca, and John Galeaz prepared to destroy this communication.—Ibid., p. 449.

[22] Ibid., tome viii. p. 141, &c.

acquisition, and spoiled of all its importance, so that Florence continued to be, what the political combinations of Italy required, a continental, much more than a maritime state[23]. But, though the Florentines failed to possess themselves of the commerce of Pisa, the enterprise was conducive to the progress of the general policy of Italy, for, while they were thus engaged, other states were suffered to prosecute their plans without interruption[24]. In this interval accordingly it was, that Venice took advantage of the distractions on the duchy of Milan to acquire her provinces on the main-land of the peninsula, and Ladislaus king of Naples established his authority on the ruin of the factions of that kingdom, so that a new equilibrium was constituted among states less numerous, but more considerable.

The republic began from the year 1414 to enjoy an undisturbed tranquillity[25]. Seven years after that time arose to power the celebrated family of the Medici, whose wisdom happily directed their measures during seventy-one years. The vigour of an oligarchical administration had procured strength for the government by various important acquisitions[26]; but the moderation of this mild and popular family was best adapted to the preservation of the prosperity, which had thus been attained. Possessing immense riches by a continued attention to commerce[27],

[23] Livorno, or, as our sailors have named it, Leghorn, did not become considerable until two centuries from that time had elapsed. However, in the year 1421, a trade with Alexandria was opened by the Florentines from that port, which they had recently obtained by purchase.—Roscoe's Lorenzo de' Medici, vol. i. p. 136. [24] Hist. des Rép. Ital., tome viii. p. 157. John Galeaz, dying in the year 1401, divided his states among his three sons; the second son was, however, after a struggle of ten years, established in the possession of the duchy and the government of Lombardy.—Ibid., pp. 73, 230.

[25] Ibid., p. 288. [26] The Guelfs had obtained possession of the government of Florence in the year 1382. Under their administration, Pisa, Arezzo, and Cortona had been reduced, and the frontiers of the republic extended everywhere much beyond the former limits, so that one half of Tuscany was subject to the signory of Florence.—Ibid. [27] The great wealth of this family was begun by John de' Medici, the grandfather of Lorenzo, surnamed the *Magnificent*. A considerable part of it probably arose from the trade, which the Florentines commenced with Alexandria, but perhaps its principal source consisted in the commercial banks

this family was enabled to acquire numerous friends by the most magnificent kindness; cautiously avoiding every pretension of ambition, they contented themselves with such power, as was voluntarily bestowed upon them by their fellow-citizens; and not influenced by vindictive feelings, though they had been objects of persecution, they never sought to gratify their resentment at the expense of the tranquillity of the republic. The arts of their ambition were private liberality, and a large contribution to plans of public charity and utility[28]. Their magnificence was not a vulgar profusion of ostentatious wealth, but an elegant expenditure on the literature, which refined, and on the arts, which embellished their country. The mild influence of such a family, while it endeared their country to the friends of literature and art, was precisely that which might most effectually substitute the combinations of political wisdom for the desultory contentions of unconnected potentates.

Giovanni de' Medici, created gonfalonier of justice, or chief magistrate of the republic, in the year 1421, was, in the year 1428, succeeded in his authority by his son Cosmo, and Cosmo, in the year 1464, by his grandson Lorenzo, who had chiefly ennobled this celebrated family. This eminent man has been described, as exhibiting a most remarkable example of depth of penetration, combined with versatility of talent and comprehension of mind[29]; and such was the facility, with which he turned his attention from the most important subjects to the light occupations of mere amusement, that his countrymen conceived, that he had two souls united in a single body. To him has his biographer attributed the actual establishment of that balance of power among the Italian governments, which almost from the beginning of the preceding century had been the object of the external policy of Florence[30]. Even before him the preservation of a political equilibrium was too important to the independence of the republic, not

which they established in almost all the trading cities of Europe.—Roscoe, vol. i. pp. 9, 135—137.

[28] The ancestors of Lorenzo had, in a course of thirty-seven years, expended on such objects more than six hundred and sixty thousand florins.—Ibid., p. 134.

[29] Roscoe, vol. ii. pp. 240, 241.

[30] Ibid., vol. ii. ch. vi.

to force itself upon the attention of its statesmen, and various combinations were accordingly formed for the purpose of resisting whatever power appeared to threaten it with subjugation; but these were temporary confederacies, accommodated only to the actual situation of affairs, and ceasing with the occasions, to which they owed their existence. It was reserved for the reflecting mind of Lorenzo de' Medici to form the various interests of the Italian states into one regulated and permanent combination, by which the projects of an ambitious government might be arrested in the very commencement. Nor were the views of this intelligent statesman confined to the circle of Italian politics, for the influence of other states upon the interests of Italy was daily increasing, and he perceived the necessity of having, at almost every court, envoys, or correspondents, who should give him early information of every occurrence, which might affect its tranquillity.

The great object of all these combinations was to restrain the ambition of Venice, which, since its enterprise had been directed to the acquisition of territory in Italy[31], had become formidable to the other states, seeming to wait only for a favourable opportunity of subduing the whole. Against that state, therefore, Lorenzo formed a confederacy with the king of Naples and the duke of Milan. This treaty, commenced before, but interrupted by various occurrences, was, with the general consent of almost all the princes and republics of Italy, resumed in the year 1480, and then concluded for twenty-five years.

[31] Venice had in the year 1387 been induced to change her policy, from the plan of seeking possessions on the opposite shore of the Adriatic to that of acquiring territory in the adjacent districts of Italy, being alarmed by the dangerous vicinity of Francis de Carrara, whose territory bordered the *Lagunes*, and reached within the distance of twenty miles from the city.—Hist. des Rép. Ital., tome vii. p. 260; tome viii. p. 134. One night this lord caused his gondoliers to carry away from their houses all the senators of Venice, who had been violent against him; and when they had been brought to him in Padua, he threatened them with death, but afterwards dismissed them, when they had bound themselves by an oath to keep the transaction secret, and to be more friendly to him in their deliberations. He admonished them, that to punish the violation of this oath by assassination, would be less difficult than to carry them thus away from their houses and country.—Ibid., tome vii. p. 199.

The salutary operation of this policy has been strongly attested by Guicciardini[32], who has declared, that, never during the thousand years, which had elapsed since the fall of the western empire, had Italy been so flourishing, or so peaceable, as towards the year 1490, when it had been maintained during ten years, and has mainly ascribed that prosperity to the wisdom of Lorenzo de' Medici. It was not however the fortune of Italy to enjoy much longer the benefit of his policy, for he was removed by a premature death in the year 1492[33], and that year became the epoch of troubles, which terminated the prosperity of Italy.

If a secure system of equilibrium could have been established among the Italian states, it would not have so entirely depended on the wisdom of one presiding statesman, that it should have been virtually dissolved at his death. But a system so well combined, as to be capable of maintaining itself by its own energies during a considerable time, would not have been suited to the temporary function of devising such an arrangement of pacific precaution, and exhibiting it for the imitation of other nations. For such a function the balance established by Lorenzo had subsisted sufficiently long, for it had during twelve years evinced the practicability and the advantage of a confederacy of independent governments for the preservation of the general independence.

The troubles, which followed the death of Lorenzo, were the process, by which the federative arrangements of his policy were extended to other states. France was the country, which was first brought to bear upon Italy, as it

[32] Hist. d'Italia, lib. i. cap. ii. M. de Sismondi has, on the other hand, given a very unfavourable representation of the policy of Lorenzo; but to his opinion may be opposed the testimony of Machiavel, whom he himself has described as a friend of freedom, together with that of Guicciardini, whom all have allowed to be impartial. The former of these writers concluded his History of Florence, and the latter commenced his History of the Wars of Italy, with an eulogy on Lorenzo. M. de Sismondi, in his zeal for liberty, appears to have been unable to perceive any wisdom in a family, which had subverted the republican government of his favourite Florence.

[33] It is remarkable that in this same year the death of an indolent pontiff made room for the advancement of Alexander VI., to whom Guicciardini has ascribed very superior ability, but adding that it was obscured by his crimes.—Guicciardini, lib. i. cap. iv.

was that, which afterwards bore upon the German empire, when a larger system of equilibrium began to be constructed. Italy was accordingly overrun by two of the French kings; by Charles VIII. in the year 1494, and by Louis XII. in the year 1499. The claim of the succession of the crown of Naples was the occasion of the former irruption, a pretension to the great duchy of Milan was the occasion of the latter.

The kingdom of Naples had in the year 1343 fallen under the government of a female, Joanna I., who occupied the throne during thirty-eight years; and after thirty-three years it fell to another Joanna, who held it during twenty-one. The various connexions formed by these two female sovereigns, proved the causes of struggles[34], which disturbed and enfeebled the government. Among these connexions were adoptions of two princes of the family of Anjou, both named Louis, and the latter of them the grandson of the former. Neither of these princes indeed possessed the sovereign power in Naples, but Joanna II., having survived her adopted son Louis II., bequeathed her kingdom to René, his brother, who after seven years was driven from it by the king of Sicily, and retired to France with his pretension. The claim of René was transmitted to Louis XI. of France[35], and through this prince to his son Charles VIII., who was induced to lead an army in vindication of it into Italy.

[34] Joanna I. was first married to the second son of the king of Hungary, then to the duke of Taranto, next to James of Aragon, and lastly to the duke of Brunswick; she then adopted as her son Louis of Aragon, brother to Charles V. king of France. Joanna II., niece of the former, married the count de la Marche, of the royal family of France; she then adopted successively Alfonso king of Aragon and Sicily, and Louis III. of Aragon, grandson of the prince of the same name, who had been adopted by Joanna I. [35] Réne, dying without male issue, bequeathed his states and pretensions to Charles of Aragon, the son of his brother, who, dying some time afterwards without children, bequeathed them to Louis XI. of France. By this succession some important advantages were conveyed to Louis, for the duchy of Anjou was united to the crown, and Provence was added to the kingdom. This monarch however was always averse from any attempt to assert a claim to the crown of Naples.—Guicciardini, lib. i. cap. ix. If Louis XI. had at all engaged in an invasion of Italy, or if Charles VIII. had undertaken such an enterprise before the tenth year of his reign, the administration of Lorenzo de' Medici would have been disturbed by the violences of war, and his system of

Seven years after the death of the second Joanna, Alfonso king of Sicily drove from the throne of Naples René of Anjou, to whom she had bequeathed it, and took possession of that other kingdom. The two kingdoms of Naples and Sicily were thus united under a common sovereign during sixteen years, after which they became again distinct, though under princes of the same Aragonian family, and continued separate during forty-five years, at the end of which time, or in the year 1503, they were again united under Ferdinand of Aragon. Of the temporary union of the two kingdoms under Alfonso, two bearings may be indicated. By the expulsion of René it gave occasion to the claim of the French government and the expedition of Charles VIII.; and the temporary union itself made preparation for the permanent connexion afterwards effected, by which they were both eventually conveyed to the emperor Charles V.[36], an arrangement important to the combinations of the sixteenth century.

It may deserve notice, that the temporary union, which appears to have been followed by these consequences, was terminated six years before the commencement of the government of Lorenzo, so that in the time of this statesman the interests of Italy were again in their ordinary arrangement, in which they might best be adjusted and combined by his sagacity.

In effecting the ultimate union, it appears to have been important to the subsequent combinations of the policy of Europe, that the Spanish connexion of Sicily should prevail over the French connexion of Naples. That Sicily should thus have reduced Naples, rather than that Naples should have reduced Sicily, seems to have been determined by causes of a personal and contingent character. Though the troubles[37], which agitated the Neapolitan government, in consequence of the failure of the male line of the reigning family, procured for Sicily some years of tran-

equilibrium could not have existed, or must have been even in his own time destroyed. [36] Ferdinand, who ultimately united the Neapolitan kingdom to those of Sicily and Aragon, had married Isabella of Castile, and left only one child, his daughter Joanna, who married Philip archduke of Austria, the father of the emperor Charles V. [37] Hist. de Sicile, par Burigny, tome ii. pp. 267, 274; 281—284. Haye, 1745.

quillity, yet the relative situation of the insular kingdom was one of decided inferiority, which was reversed only by the personal qualities of Alfonso. That the union should have been terminated at his death, was the result of the circumstances of his family, the kingdom of Naples, which he had acquired for himself, being bequeathed to his illegitimate son Ferdinand, while John, his brother and legitimate heir, succeeded to the kingdoms of Sicily and Aragon, which he had inherited[38]. John, indeed, claimed also the crown of Naples, as due to his birth; but Ferdinand, having married his daughter, induced him to withdraw his pretension. When however the invasions of the French kings, particularly that of Louis XII., had broken down the government of Naples, and expelled the king, it was not difficult for a kindred and neighbouring prince to assert and establish his claim to the throne.

It has been represented that Milan had been the object of the political apprehensions of Florence, before Lorenzo de Medici perceived the necessity of forming a confederation with this very state and the kingdom of Naples, to restrain the overwhelming aggrandisement of Venice. Of this transfer of ascendency from Milan to Venice, two distinct bearings may be pointed out. Milan, so long as that duchy retained its superiority, could not find an interest in introducing the French into Italy, which measure however formed the immediate crisis of the extension of a

[38] The connexion of Sicily with Aragon, originally formed by the advancement of Peter of Aragon to the throne of Sicily in the year 1282, was dissolved at his death in the year 1285. The separation was, after a short interruption, renewed in the year 1296, but the two countries became permanently connected in the year 1402. Burigny, tome ii. pp. 215, 224, 228, 284, 289, 290. Sicily therefore, though governed by an Aragonian dynasty, had been detached from Aragon during almost the whole of a period of a hundred and seventeen years, in which it seems to have acted only as a counterpoise to the French government established at Naples. The forty years which followed appear to have been a period preparatory to the reduction of Naples, effected by Alfonso of Sicily. In this period accordingly Sicily was strengthened by the connexion with Aragon; and, though Naples and Sicily were again separated at the death of Alfonso, the connexion of Sicily with Aragon remained eventually to enable Sicily to effect, after forty-five years more, a second conquest of Naples, and to transfer the two crowns of Sicily and Naples to the emperor Charles V.

balancing policy from the interior concerns of Italy to the general combinations of Europe; for only an apprehension of overpowering hostility, entirely inconsistent with the possession of such a superiority, but aggravated by a recent recollection of the possession of it, could have disposed the duke of Milan to have recourse to an expedient so manifestly dangerous to his independence. That the ascendency should have been transferred to Venice had this operation, that it first caused that republic, in her prosecution of the plan of territorial aggrandisement, to neglect her distant possessions, her commerce, and her marine, and that it eventually gave being to the league of Cambrai, which reduced her to the lowest humiliation. As Venice was the great agent of that earlier system of commerce[39] which was limited to the seas of Europe, it was expedient that her commercial greatness should be humbled before the commencement of the new system of extended navigation. Weakened as she had been, she

[39] The power of the Genoese was ruined in the contest concluded in the year 1381, from which violent struggle Venice, on the contrary, began a new career of prosperity. Genoa was distracted by the contending factions of the Fregosi and the Adorni, the former of which sought to establish its own power by the assistance of France. After numerous alternations of subjection and revolt, this state recovered its independence in the year 1528, but far more reduced in importance than Venice. 'Sanuto has preserved an interesting account of the wealth and commerce of Venice in those days (the earlier part of the fifteenth century). This is thrown into the mouth of the doge Mocenigo, whom he represents as dissuading his country, with his dying words, from undertaking a war against Milan. Through peace our city has every year,' he said, 'ten millions of ducats employed as mercantile capital in different parts of the world; the annual profit of our traders upon this sum amounts to four millions. Our housing is valued at seven millions of ducats; its annual rental at five hundred thousand. Three thousand merchant ships carry on our trade; forty-three gallies, and three hundred smaller vessels, manned by nineteen thousand sailors, secure our naval power. Our mint has coined one million of ducats within the year. From the Milanese dominions alone we draw one million of ducats in coin, and the value of nine hundred thousand more in cloths; our profit upon this traffic may be reckoned at six hundred thousand ducats. Proceeding as you have done to acquire this wealth, you will become masters of all the gold in Christendom; but war, and especially unjust war, will lead infallibly to ruin.—Hallam's State of Europe during the Mid. Ages, vol. i. pp. 346, 347.

struggled against it, entering into a confederacy with the Turks, to resist and frustrate the enterprises of the Portuguese, when these had effected the important discovery of a maritime communication with India.

The alliance formed by Lorenzo against Venice[40] was rescinded at the end of one year from his death, Milan having deserted the league, and entered into a new confederacy with Venice and the pope. The peculiar situation of the duchy of Milan had formed the weak part of the combination of Lorenzo. That duchy had been usurped by Louis Sforza, in the minority of his nephew, who was the rightful duke, and had married the grand-daughter of Ferdinand king of Naples. Lorenzo had, through policy, persuaded Ferdinand to enter into a confederacy with the usurper for resisting Venice, but, after his death, Louis became alarmed for his own security, and sought to strengthen himself in the possession of his usurped dominion by confederating with that state, against which the former combination had been directed. When Louis had adopted this measure, he began to apprehend that the new connexion might, like the former, be dissolved by a contrariety of interests, and in his alarm determined to have recourse to the dangerous expedient of inviting Charles VIII. of France to enter Italy with an army, and assert the pretension to the throne of Naples, which he had derived from the family of Anjou.

France was just then prepared to undertake the enterprise recommended by the despair of Louis Sforza. Scarcely had forty years elapsed, since Charles VII. had united to his dominions Normandy and Guienne, which had been held by the English ; in the latter years of Louis XI. the county of Provence and the duchy of Burgundy had also been acquired to the crown ; and Charles VIII. himself had recently joined Britanny to his other states, by his marriage with the heiress of that considerable territory. The nobles indeed of the French court, and the graver ministers of the king, were all disinclined[41] to an expedition against a country so distant, and governed by a king, who in a reign of thirty-five years had enjoyed full time for establishing his power. The vanity however of a

[40] Guicciardini, lib. i. cap. i.—viii. [41] Ibid., lib. i. cap. x.

young and thoughtless prince prevailed over their caution, especially as he had abandoned himself to a set of upstart favourites, some of whom were corrupted by Louis Sforza, and others were desirous of procuring establishments in the kingdom of Naples, or benefices and ecclesiastical dignities from the Roman pontiff, who had been induced by the duke of Milan to engage in the same cause.

The French under Charles VIII. advanced through Italy without interruption, a single siege on the frontier of the Neapolitan territory determining the fortune of the country. Their prosperity was however checked[42] by the extreme carelessness, with which they neglected to possess themselves of the few places still remaining to the Spaniards, and by the arrogance, with which they offended the feelings of the conquered. But a combination[43], occasioned by this very success, was formed by the pope, the emperor, Spain, Venice, and the duke of Milan, which must have compelled the French monarch to abandon his acquisition, even if the country had been completely reduced. Charles VIII., who had already in the levity of his character determined to return home, was forced by this confederacy to hasten his departure; and, a large part of the army being withdrawn for the protection of his retreat, the kingdom was recovered by its former sovereign with as much rapidity, as it had been lost.

The transient expedition of Charles VIII. having pointed out to the French the facility, with which conquest might be achieved among the unwarlike inhabitants of Italy, that country was invaded five years afterwards by his successor Louis XII., who, besides inheriting the pretension to the kingdom of Naples, was also prompted by a desire of asserting a claim to the duchy of Milan, which had devolved to him as duke of Orleans[44]. This prince had not, like his predecessors, the support of the duchy of Milan, the acquisition of which was one of his objects;

[42] Guicciardini, lib. ii. cap. xiii. [43] Ibid., cap. xi. xii.

[44] Valentina, daughter of John Galeaz Visconti, married Louis duke of Orleans, brother of Charles VI. of France; and the son of Valentina having married a daughter of Louis XI., his son Louis became king of France after the death of Charles VIII.—Guicciardini, lib. iv. cap. ii. iii.

but the Venetians[45] were induced to support him by their hatred of Louis Sforza duke of Milan, and the pontiff was gained by a promise of the assistance of the French king in his schemes of aggrandisement.

The French king failed in his project of conquering the Neapolitan kingdom, but was successful in acquiring the duchy of Milan, except those parts, which had been by treaty conceded to the Venetians for their co-operation. These concessions served to engage him in a great combination of Italian politics, which four years afterwards produced the celebrated league of Cambrai, concluded for the reduction of the formidable power acquired by Venice among the states of Italy.

The confederacy formed by the Venetians to intercept Charles VIII. in his return, must have convinced Louis that they were the people, by whom the stability of an Italian conquest was most liable to be shaken. Instructed by this proceeding, and at the same time desirous of possessing himself of those parts of the Milanese territory, which he had been induced to cede to them, he concluded in the year 1504[46] a treaty with the pope and the emperor, by which, among other articles, it was stipulated, that a war should be commenced against the Venetians, for the recovery of those territories, of which the contracting parties had been respectively deprived. This was however a combination, which could not be immediately completed among states not yet habitually connected in the relations of international policy, and various fluctuations of political interests[47], in which each of the parties was false to the alliance, rapidly succeeded, before it was accomplished in the league of Cambrai. This extraordinary series of inconsistent negotiations, while it demonstrates the imperfection of the diplomacy of this period, manifests also the difficulty of the great process, which was then involving the states of Europe in the relations of political equilibrium, devised not long before for the Italian governments by Lorenzo de Medici.

[45] Guicciardini, cap. xi.

[46] Ibid., lib. vi. cap. xxxvii.

[47] Ibid., lib. vi. cap. xl.; lib. vii. cap. i. ii. xiv. xv. xxix. xxxi. xxxii.

The league of Cambrai[48] was concluded in the year 1508 between the Roman pontiff, the king of France, the emperor, and the king of Aragon and the two Sicilies, for the reduction of the exorbitant power of the Venetians. The pope claimed Faenza[49], Rimini, Ravenna, and Cervia, as belonging to the church; the emperor, Padua, Vicenza, Verona, for the empire, and Friuli and Treviso for the house of Austria; the king of France, Cremona, Chiaradadda, Bresse, Bergamo, and Cremé; and the king of Aragon three ports and places of the Neapolitan kingdom, which had been pledged to the Venetians. For executing this confederacy the king of France entered Italy in the following year, when he gained over the Venetians a decisive victory. The emperor and the pontiff then attacking them on other sides, they were driven to despair, and even formed the determination of abandoning all the territory, which they possessed beyond the *lagunes*.

Though the pride of the ambitious republic was severely humbled by the coalition, it was however soon discovered that no necessity existed for renouncing the whole of the Italian acquisitions[50]. The pontiff, alarmed at the aggrandisement of his allies, the emperor and the king of France, and satisfied with recovering the places which he had him-

[48] M. de Sismondi, while he recognises in the league of Cambrai the commencement of the diplomacy and public law of Europe, condemns it as a measure of the most atrocious injustice, describing it as a scheme of unprovoked and unprincipled spoliation, concerted against an unoffending and meritorious government.—Hist. des Rép. Ital., tome xiii. p. 417. A very different view of the transaction has however been presented by the impartial Guicciardini. In his narrative of a deliberation of the Venetian senate, in the preceding year, this historian has put into the mouth of one of the senators a speech, describing the state as confessedly and justly an object of general apprehension.—Lib. vii. cap. xxvii. In a deliberation also, held in the following year, when the pope proposed to withdraw from the confederacy, if he could obtain satisfaction of his particular demands, a senator of very high rank, and of great authority, is represented as urging, that it had always been the spirit of the republic to increase her empire, and contending that to give way in any instance would be ruinous policy.—Lib. viii. cap. iv. M. de Sismondi seems to have been unable to perceive any justice in the cause of a confederacy, which reduced the power of the principal of the Italian states, and thus lowered the general importance of the Peninsula. [49] Hist. des Rép. Ital., tome xiii. lib. viii. cap. iii. [50] Ibid., cap. xx.—xxiii.

self claimed, began to favour the Venetians: the king of France, with a scrupulous moderation, limited his acquisitions to those places for which he had stipulated in the treaty, declining to take possession of others relinquished by the enemy: and, above all, the negligence and weakness of the emperor, hindering him from leading an army to join the confederates, rendered his part of the claims almost ineffectual, as no troops were ready for receiving the places, which had been procured for him by the arms of the French.

Venice was thus preserved from destruction, but its power had received a decisive blow at a most critical period of its fortune. Eleven years before the conclusion of the league of Cambrai, the Portuguese had ascertained the practicability of sailing round Africa to India; and it was precisely during the movements of the confederacy then formed, that the Venetians were deprived of the valuable commerce of the east by the interference of the adventurers of Portugal. The king of France, when he had been the chief agent in this important diversion, was driven out of Italy by the negotiations of the Roman pontiff[51], which had induced Henry VIII. of England to threaten France with invasion. Milan was accordingly ceded to the son of Louis Sforza, its former duke.

While Florence was forming in Italy a system of balanced policy, and France was involving herself in its combinations, the papal government was resuming its proper position in the capital of the ancient empire, and preparing itself for the struggle of the reformation, which soon afterwards ensued, and powerfully operated in establishing the more general balance of the European governments.

The establishment of the papacy in Avignon, where it continued to be stationed during sixty-eight years, had very much reduced its authority. In most of the cities subject to the pontiff, the principal citizens usurped the supreme power[52]; Rome itself, though it still professed to acknowledge the papal dominion, was really independent; and the people of Europe in general did not much regard

[51] Guicciardini, lib. x. cap. viii.—xxx; lib. xi. cap. ii.—xvi.
[52] Ibid., lib. iv. cap. xlvii. Mosh., cent. xiv. part ii. ch. ii. sect. v.

the decrees of those, who were aliens from the ancient seat of the ecclesiastical monarchy. The restoration of the papacy, amidst so much disorder, was not an easy enterprise. It was accomplished in the year 1376, when the necessary preparation had been made by the instrumentality of an individual, most singularly adapted to the circumstances, in which he acted.

Nicholas Gabrini, surnamed di Rienzi, a diminutive of the name of his father Laurentius, combined in his character an extraordinary variety of virtue and vice, of ability and weakness, all however favouring the re-establishment of the papacy. A zealous friend of order and justice in the beginning of his career, he was fitted to introduce that improvement of the public manners, which the condition of Rome had rendered indispensable; and yet such were the follies of his latter conduct, that he was disqualified for giving to his power so much stability, as would have obstructed the return of a superior authority. His genius was such, as enabled him to conciliate and to rule the Roman people, and he has been in particular described as one of the most eloquent men of his age; and the extravagance and buffoonery, which were blended with this ability, protected him from the opposition of the nobles, by whom he was derided and despised[53], without offending the fantastic character of the populace, which he managed. How peculiarly indeed Rienzi was suited to his situation, was sufficiently proved by the unpopularity of Cerroni[54], who was chosen chief of the people in the interval of the two administrations of Rienzi, and attempted to rule them with the moderation of an orderly government. When this other demagogue had held the government almost twenty months, he retired, and left the people to the agitations, which seemed to be necessary to their gratification.

Though born in a very humble class of life[55], Rienzi had

[53] The Colonnas even invited him frequently to their palace to furnish them amusement, and, considering him as a mere fool of no importance, laughed at the sarcasms, which he uttered against themselves. Petrarch has accordingly described him as the Brutus of this modern revolution.—Mem. pour la Vie de Pétrarque, tome ii. pp. 326, 338. [54] Conjur. de Rienzi par Du Cerceau, p. 243. Amst. 1734. [55] Mem. pour la Vie de Pétrarque, tome ii. pp. 48—50.

been carefully educated, and from the study of the Roman classics had caught such a veneration for the ancient glory of Rome, that in his early youth he passed entire days in examining the ruined monuments of her former greatness. Emerging from his inferior station by his talents and acquirements, he became known to history in the year 1342, when he was appointed to be the colleague of Petrarch, in a solemn deputation sent by the people of Rome to Clement VI. to solicit his return. Though he failed in the object of his embassy, he made a favourable impression on the mind of the pontiff, for two years afterwards he was appointed apostolic notary at Rome, the daily salary of his office being five florins of gold. In the year 1347[56], when he had prepared the people for his purpose, by discharging his office with much affectation of disinterested justice, and by frequently inveighing against the oppressions of the great, he began the revolution, which he had long meditated.

He suspended in the capitol, and in other public places, various emblematical pictures, representing the misery and degradation of Rome, which he explained in the most animated harangues. He then attached to one of the gates a writing, which declared that the people should soon be re-established in *the good state*, terms frequently employed as the watchword of his party. He next assembled in secret on Mount Aventine those, whom he thought worthy of his confidence, being favoured by the absence of Stephen Colonna, who would have rendered such a convention impracticable. When he had in this meeting pointed out the funds of the apostolic chamber as a resource, and had calmed the scruples of his associates by pretending to maintain all deference for the pontiff, he at length made proclamation by sound of trumpet, that all should assemble without arms on the night preceding Whitsunday in the church of the castle of St. Angelo, to provide for *the good state*. In that church he assisted at masses of the Holy Spirit from midnight to the ninth hour of the following day, which he selected for his enterprise, that he might appear to act under the inspiration of the third person of the Holy Trinity. At that time he sallied forth with his

[56] Mem. pour la Vie de Pétrarque, tome ii. pp. 320, &c.

head uncovered, attended by a hundred men armed as he was also himself, and accompanied by the vicar of the pope, a simple man whom he had persuaded of the innocence of his views, while the people followed in a crowd, ignorant of his design. When Rienzi had thus led the people to the capitol, he addressed them with a speech, in which he expatiated on the regulations of *the good state*, and was immediately invested with unlimited power, for carrying them into execution. Still however he had the moderation to content himself with the title of tribune, and he even, through policy, desired that the papal vicar should be associated with him, having indeed no reason for being apprehensive of such a colleague.

The salutary influence of his government soon became conspicuous. The roads became safe, agriculture was revived, pilgrims resorted to the city, and mercantile dealings were resumed; and, as the reputation of the integrity of Rienzi diffused itself beyond the limits of his own territory, appeals were presented to him for decision from every part of Italy, and even from foreign countries[57] applications were made for his judgment or his mediation. The design of Rienzi was indeed by no means limited to the re-establishment of the liberty and tranquillity of Rome, but embraced the restoration of her ancient dominion; and in the brief period of his government he actually accomplished the reduction of the papal state. Such was the revolution suddenly effected by this enthusiast of classic recollections, whose success was hailed by Petrarch in the same classic spirit, with the most animated interest. The papal greatness had been originally prepared by the dominion, which had invested with a lasting authority the ancient capital of the west; and it seems as if the shade of its departed power had been at this time conjured from the tomb, to facilitate the return of the exiled pontiff.

The intemperance of prosperity presently betrayed the

[57] The king of Hungary submitted to his cognisance the question of the death of his brother Andrew king of Naples, of which he accused queen Joanna, Louis of Taranto, and Charles of Durazzo; but Rienzi, though the cause was solemnly heard, abstained from pronouncing judgment. The emperor Louis V. also, whom the pope had recently deposed, solicited his mediation.

follies and vices of Rienzi[58], and precipitated his ruin. From the greatest simplicity he, with his whole family, passed at once to an extreme degree of magnificence and luxury, inconsistent with his character of tribune; and he resolved to assume the dignity of knighthood, which belonged to the nobles. In the unusual ceremonies[59], observed on the occasion of assuming his new dignity, he offended the superstition of the people: he excited disgust by the idle arrogance, with which, in the solemnities of his inauguration, he summoned before him the two candidates, who were then contending for the empire, Louis duke of Bavaria and Charles king of Bohemia, together with the German electors: and a project of exterminating all the nobles of Rome, which he had almost carried into execution, having driven them to desperation, they commenced an open war against him, which rendered the inhabitants weary of a government no longer capable of affording protection. The tribune was able to defeat the assault of his enemies, but his victory was the crisis of his fall. Persuaded that his enemies were then entirely subdued he, indulged himself in the most excessive luxury, which he maintained by oppression of every kind. The papal legate perceived the advantage afforded by the popular detestation of Rienzi; a small force, secretly procured from the party of the nobles, advanced to the capitol, where he resided; and, when it appeared that the people would not assemble for his support at the sound of the bell of the capitol, he sought refuge in the castle of Saint Angelo, and soon afterwards retired from Rome, where he had held the government but seven months.

The influence of this singular individual however was not terminated by the catastrophe, which had thus ruined his sovereignty, for he was by the pontiff himself considered as indispensable to the restoration of the public order in Rome, and was accordingly sent thither with his express sanction. Invested at his return with a legitimate

[58] Mem. pour la Vie de Pétrarque, tome ii. pp. 365, &c. [59] He used for his bath a vase of porphyry, in which it was believed that the emperor Constantine had bathed himself, when he had been cured of leprosy by the pope; and he chose afterwards to sleep in a part of the church regarded as especially sacred.

authority, when he had been previously disciplined by adversity, it might be supposed that he would at this time have maintained his station in moderation and tranquillity; but his evil propensities had been inflamed by his discomfiture, and after his restoration he was even more intoxicated than before with the enjoyment of power. The second administration of Rienzi accordingly was terminated by assassination, when it had continued not quite four months. But, short as it was, it produced the effect, which had been proposed, for the authority of the papacy was preserved in Rome from this time, until after twenty-two years that city became again the residence of the pontiffs.

The immediate occasion of the return of the papacy[60] was perhaps chiefly that, in the year 1376, the government of Florence had excited a revolt among the governors of the ecclesiastical state. Rome however continued but a short time after this event to be submissive to the authority of the papacy, the refractory spirit of the ancient capital being speedily manifested; nor was the papal dominion securely established in it[61] before the pontificate of Eugenius IV. who was elected in the year 1431. The cities of Romagna and the other dependencies of the Roman see having been also almost wholly alienated from it, the effectual recovery of them became necessary to the authority of the papacy. This was the work of two very remarkable agents, the infamous Alexander VI. and his equally infamous son Cæsar Borgia, the former of whom has been named by Mosheim the Nero of the pontiffs, and the latter is memorable as the original of the *Prince* of Machiavel. Alexander, who began his papacy in the year 1491, proposed as his great object the formation of a principality for Cæsar Borgia, and he succeeded in constituting him duke of Romagna, to which he aspired to unite the sovereignty of Naples, then contested by the French and Spaniards, but claimed by the pontiff as having devolved to his see. But, while these two execrable men were for their own purposes availing themselves of the influence of the papacy, they were the unconscious instruments of the

[60] Hist. des Papes, tome iii. p. 504. [61] Guicciardini, lib. iv. cap. xlvii.

renovation of the papal dominion[62]. The edifice of grandeur, erected for Cæsar Borgia, yielded to the assaults of Julius II., whose enterprising ambition formed the immediate preparation of the papacy for the approaching struggle of the reformation.

As long as the struggle of the Roman see was waged with the chief of the empire, France was naturally its friend, and a French family was accordingly placed on the throne of Naples, to afford it the most speedy and effectual support. But in the struggle of the reformation, of which Germany was the great theatre, the chief of the empire became the ally, not the adversary of Rome, and France, though a Romish government, found a political interest in supporting the protestant princes of Germany against their sovereign. In correspondence to this change of external relations the French family of the Neapolitan princes had in the year 1442 been succeeded by a Spanish dynasty, and Naples in the year 1503 had been permanently united under the same Spanish succession with Sicily and Aragon, so as to bring Spain into that connexion with the papacy, which had been before maintained by France. For this function Spain had been specially prepared by seven centuries of hostility waged against infidels, and its recent triumph over their last possession in the peninsula.

The alienation of the papacy from France was begun in the pontificate of Alexander VI.[63], who at last perceived that he could not prosecute his schemes of aggrandisement for his son, without encountering resistance from the measures of Louis XII.: it was increased by the more liberal policy of Julius II., who saw that the expulsion of this prince from Italy[64] was necessary to its independence; and it was confirmed by Leo X.[65], who had brought with him to the papal throne the personal resentments of his family, caused by the recollection[66], that France had occasioned the expulsion of his family from Florence.

[62] Révol. d'Italie, tome vi. p. 427. [63] Guicciardini, lib. vi. cap. vi. [64] Ibid., lib. viii. cap. xxxiv. [65] Ibid., lib. xi. cap. xxx.

[66] Ibid., cap. xxix. When Charles VIII. was advancing against Naples, Peter de' Medici, son of Lorenzo, determined the Florentines to refuse him a passage and supplies, but afterwards, being alarmed at the approach of the king, made so great concessions, that he was driven from Florence, and the power of his family ruined,

The interests of the papacy and the Neapolitan kingdom were the only Italian interests, which continued to influence in any considerable degree the combinations of Europe. Florence had exercised her various functions of commerce, of intellectual refinement, and of policy; and her transient system of equilibrium had done all which it was fitted to do, in presenting an example for larger and more durable relations for federative connexion. Venice too had fulfilled a high fortune in becoming the great agent of the earlier system of commerce, to be overborne only by the discoveries of unbounded adventure; and the general hostility, which her ambition had provoked, while it compelled her to yield almost without resistance to the new order of commerce, had given an actual beginning to that extended combination of various governments, which has since comprehended all the states of Europe. The decay of Italy, which was begun at the death of Lorenzo de Medici, was consummated at the fall of Florence in the year 1530[67], when that city was taken by the generals of the emperor Charles V. The papacy however still preserved its importance by the hierarchy over which it presided, and the connexions which it maintained with the governments of other countries; and the kingdom of the two Sicilies just served to establish a communication, which attached to the ecclesiastical principality the bigotry of Spain. Thus supported, the pontiff has continued to reign amidst the moral desolation of a people destitute of character, because deprived of liberty, as his residence is encompassed by a pestilential atmosphere, itself also generated by the same political decay.

It has been remarked by a recent historian[68], that 'from 'the death of Frederic II. in 1250, to the invasion of 'Charles VIII. in 1494, a long and undistinguished period 'occurs, which it is impossible to break into any natural 'divisions.' And again, speaking of Italy, 'her political 'history presents a labyrinth of petty facts, so obscure and 'of so little influence as not to arrest the attention; so

when it had subsisted seventy-three years.—Guicciardini, lib. i. cap. xxi. xxiii. xlix. lii.

[67] Hist. des Rép. Ital., tome xvi. p. 220.

[68] State of Europe during the Middle Ages, by Mr. Hallam, vol. i. p. 288.

'intricate and incapable of classification, as to leave only 'confusion in the memory.' If, in illustrating the general philosophy of modern history, arrangement and combination have been given to a mass of facts regarded with so much despair, this chapter may perhaps claim to be considered, as affording to the whole scheme a very strong confirmation. May it not be regarded as furnishing an illustration of the system of political, or rather of providential combination here maintained, analogous to that which the Newtonian system of the material universe received from applying the general principle of gravitation to the explanation of the numerous and complicated inequalities of the lunar motions?

CHAPTER II.

Of the history of Germany, from the death of Albert in the year 1308, *to the commencement of the reign of Charles V. in the year* 1519.

The states divided into three colleges in the year 1309—The struggle with the papacy ended, and Charles IV. king of Bohemia, emperor, 1347—*The golden bull*, 1356—John Huss began to preach against popery, 1408—Sigismond, king of Hungary and Bohemia, emperor, 1410—Huss put to death, 1415—Hussite war begun, 1419—concluded, 1434—The Austrian dynasty begun, 1437—The Turks began to invade Hungary, 1469—The archduke Maximilian married to the heiress of Burgundy, 1477—Private war abolished, the imperial chamber made permanent, the archduke Philip married to Johanna of Castile, and the Swiss confederacy independent, 1499—The circles of the empire completed, 1512.

THE history of the revolutions of religious opinion has been commonly considered, as so essentially distinguished from that of the changes of political society, that the student, who is not particularly devoted to ecclesiastical enquiry, might content himself with a very imperfect knowledge of the causes, by which these revolutions are produced, and of the circumstances, by which they are variously modified. The principles, by which man is directed in his intercourse with the Supreme Being, are

supposed to have but little connexion with those, which regulate his conduct in society; and for the purpose of general information it is thought sufficient, that the former should be occasionally noticed, when they are observed to exercise some influence upon the interest of states. This conception of the character of political history has been formed from the narratives of Greece and Rome, in which religious principles have little operation, but is utterly unsuited to governments, in which the doctrines of true religion are professed, and, however blended with error, or counteracted by depravity, are still generally respected as prescribing the rules of social obligation. In analysing the histories of Christian nations the principles of ecclesiastical changes are accordingly, not merely among the objects, to which the attention of a student of political history should be directed, but the paramount and controlling causes of the great revolutions of policy. Religious belief is among them the soul, which gives animation and expression to the features of merely political society; and a history of Christendom, in which religion is not thus considered, can resemble only casts modelled from the features of the dead, exhibiting but the forms of sunken and spiritless lineaments.

This observation, common to all the countries of Christian Europe, is more especially applicable to Germany, the country of the reformation. Germany has been more than once mentioned as the appropriate organ, by which the combinations of a federative policy have been generated among the greater governments of Europe. It is well known to have been also the country, in which the great separation from the church of Rome, distinguished by the name of the reformation, was primarily effected. But it is not sufficiently considered, how intimate was the connexion between the political and the ecclesiastical operation, how important was the latter to the accomplishment of the former.

The balance of Europe, it will hereafter be shown, was in its origin chiefly supported by the struggle of the two religious parties of the Protestants and Roman Catholics, no other principle than religion then possessing sufficient influence over the minds of men, for maintaining among

independent communities the necessary steadiness of political action. When therefore we would examine the history of Germany, as that of the country, in which the federative policy of Europe was first arranged and combined, we should search into the causes, which constituted that country also the original scene of a great division of religious parties, without which the combinations of a federative policy would have been destitute of their most operative principle.

Three distinct movements of reformation have been made in the German territories; in Bohemia, in Saxony, and in Swisserland[1]. These were various and independent exertions, differing in time and place and character, and exercising very different influences on the political relations of Europe.

The Bohemian effort of reformation, violent in its character, and after a furious struggle finally suppressed, appears to have driven the chiefs of the empire, though long opposed to the pretensions of the papal see, into a close adherence to its cause, instead of drawing them, like the kings of Denmark and Sweden, into a concurrence with a prevailing change of religious opinion. The Saxon and the Helvetic reformations, peaceable in their character, and permanent in their establishment, were the supports of the interest opposed to that of Rome, while they served to maintain an interior balance of religious and ecclesiastical opinion among Protestants.

In regarding the local and political circumstances of the German territories, as they were connected with these three several movements, we may discover an extremely curious correspondence to the tendencies, by which they have thus been respectively distinguished. For the efforts of Huss was provided a territory, formed for a separate government by the natural demarcation of a mountainous boundary, yet in the immediate vicinity of that Austrian dominion, on which the violence of its reformers may be conceived to have produced its effect. The successful reformation of Luther was accommodated with the distant, but consider-

[1] The Swiss cantons were nominally subject to the German crown, their independence being first formally acknowledged in the treaty of Westphalia, concluded in the year 1648.

able province of Saxony, in which the control of the general government was scarcely acknowledged. As the Helvetic reformation was a system of more freedom than the Saxon, the Helvetic provinces had been previously thrown off from the German empire, and, though still in a nominal dependence, formed into a republican confederacy. It was perfected in the little republic of Geneva, which was independent of that confederacy, had been goaded to resistance by the misconduct of its bishop, and was so limited in territory, that Calvin could combine in its council the ecclesiastical and political authorities.

For the political function of the German government, by which it gave a beginning to an extended system of federative policy, it was necessary that its combination should be relaxed as much as was at all compatible with its integrity. It was however also necessary that, while its combination should be relaxed, its irregularity should be as much as possible reduced to order. If the combination of the government had been in any degree maintained, it could not have become the nucleus of a federative policy; and if it had not been reduced to order by numerous improvements of its arrangements, it could scarcely have been a useful instrument in effecting an orderly combination of the interests of independent communities.

In the period reviewed in the present chapter, only the Bohemian reformation was comprehended; but the same period exhibits the political combination of the empire as reduced to the extreme degree of relaxation, and its orderly arrangement as receiving all the improvement, of which such a government can be conceived to be susceptible, the authority of the imperial dignity being at length supported by the external power of the Austrian family, in which it became hereditary. The objects to be at present contemplated are accordingly the Bohemian reformation, the increased relaxation of the imperial government, the several improvements of the political order, the establishment of an hereditary series of Austrian emperors, and their extraordinary aggrandisement.

The reign of Henry VII., the immediate successor of Albert I., occupied but four years and a half, and seems to have been one of those intervals already noticed in the

history of Germany, which permitted the government to recover some degree of vigour, after the shocks, to which it was repeatedly exposed. This prince[2] is described as having distinguished himself before his exaltation by his extraordinary exertions for the support of public justice, and the preservation of the public tranquillity, though yet more by the courage and address, which he exhibited in the tournaments of the age. The circumstances, also, in which he was advanced to the throne, were favourable to the internal quiet of his reign, for his election[3] was secretly favoured by the Roman pontiff, who had just then found it necessary to remove his see to Avignon, and was too apprehensive of the aggrandisement of his powerful protector, the king of France, to be willing that his brother, who was the competitor of Henry, should be placed upon the throne of the empire. Nor was the beneficial influence of this reign confined to the mere maintenance of the existing order, but it was also distinguished by an improvement in the arrangement of the government, for the states of the empire[4] were then first distributed into the three separate colleges, of the electors, the princes[5], and the imperial cities.

Henry VII. was, in the year 1313, succeeded by Louis V., whose reign of thirty-three years is remarkable for a renewed contest with the papacy, in which an emperor was for the last time attacked by a papal excommunication. A turbulent interregnum of four months, terminated only by the defeat and captivity of his competitor, a duke of Austria, announced the disturbances of the government of this prince, as it seemed to promise a powerful party for the support of whoever might be his adversary. John XXII., the pontiff of his time, by birth a Frenchman[6], availed himself of the discontents of Germany to effect the deposition of Louis, in favour of the king of France, when the emperor had protected the duke of Milan against the papal legate. Claiming the right of examining a contested election[7], he condemned Louis for having assumed the title of

[2] Schmidt, tome iv. p. 413. [3] Ibid., p. 405. [4] Pfeffel, tome i. p. 468. [5] The privileges of a prince of the empire, in the beginning of the fourteenth century, were a right of voting in the diet, and a right of establishing provincial laws.—Ibid., p. 474.

[6] Schmidt, tome iv. pp. 445, 448, 449. [7] Innocent III. had first claimed the right of examining and approving the election of the emperor.—Ibid., p. 451.

king of the Romans without his approbation; and arrogating likewise the right of administering the imperial government during a vacancy of the throne, he condemned him also for having exercised the imperial dignity, and more particularly for having supported the enemies of the church. Louis, having disregarded the orders of the pope, by which he had been directed to abdicate the empire, and to submit himself to the judgment of the papal see, was declared to be deprived of all the rights of his election, and subjected to the penalties of excommunication. Though the emperor did not immediately yield to the haughty pretensions of the pontiff, but repeatedly appealed to a future council[8]. and even charged the pope with favouring heretics, and maintaining heretical opinions[9], he at length gave way, apparently without necessity, and descended from one humiliation to another, even to a proposal of abdicating his crown in favour of his cousin. The minds of the Germans however revolted against the extravagance of the papal pretensions, urged to favour the designs of France, and the electors were so much alarmed for their own particular rights, which must have perished with the independence of the empire, that they asserted this independence in a formal ordinance, which was confirmed by a diet. So strongly indeed did the electors disapprove the conduct of the emperor, that they required him to abdicate the crown, which he had so debased, and, when he refused to resign it to any other than his own son, they replied, 'Under thy reign, Bavarian, the empire has been so much enfeebled, that we must take care, for the future, not to intrust it to a Bavarian[10].'

As this struggle extinguished the pretensions of the papacy against the empire, so was Louis the last emperor,

[8] Pfeffel, tome i. p. 496. [9] The Franciscans, who disclaimed all property, contended that Jesus Christ and his apostles possessed none; the opposite opinion was maintained by this pontiff. With this, as a heresy, he was charged by Louis, in conjunction with the Franciscans.—Schmidt, tome iv. pp. 456, 457. [10] He abandoned Pleisse to the margraves of Misnia; the imperial cities of Brisac, Schaffhausen, Rheinfeld, and Newburgh on the Rhine, to the dukes of Austria; to the king of Bohemia the city of Egra; to the margraves of Brandenburgh the duchy of Pomerania; and to the counts of Guelderland the greater part of East Friesland.—Ibid. pp. 535, 536.

who maintained the rights of the empire in Italy[11]. The embarrassing combination of the two governments had produced its full effect in relaxing the constitution of the empire, and the time was approaching, in which it would be expedient, that the removal of all reciprocal pretensions should permit the imperial and the papal power to unite their efforts, for the support of the existing institutions of the church against the party of the reformation.

As soon as these mutual claims had been thus extinguished, a king of Bohemia was placed on the imperial throne, Louis V. being succeeded by Charles IV., grandson of the emperor Henry VII., and in right of his mother the king of Bohemia. That country becoming, sixty-one years afterwards, the theatre of the reforming efforts of John Huss[12], which will be shown to have served to attach the imperial authority to the support of the papacy, the advancement of its sovereign to the throne of the empire, which tended to connect the local agitations of Bohemia with the general interests of Germany, naturally followed the suppression of the ancient hostility, which through ages had alienated the imperial and papal powers.

In the reign of Charles IV. the double process, of an increasing relaxation of the imperial government, and of an improvement in the order of its arrangements, is sufficiently conspicuous. He completed the dissipation of the imperial revenues[13], probably hoping that the electors might thus be necessitated to continue the imperial dignity in his family, as alone able to sustain its majesty; and he suffered the judicial authority of the crown to sink wholly into disuse[14], partly by residing in Bohemia, and thereby losing the concurrent jurisdiction, which his predecessors had exercised in their progresses through Germany, and partly by lavishing on the states the privilege, by which they were exempted from any external judicature. His reign was, on the other hand, distinguished by an important regulation, named *the golden bull*[15], by which the number, rank, rights, and suc-

[11] Pfeffel, i. p. 507. [12] So named from Hussinetz, a small town of Bohemia.—Hist. de la Guerre des Hussites et du Concile de Basle, par Lenfant, i. p. 24. Amst. 1731. [13] Pfeffel, i. pp. 536, 537. [14] Ibid.

[15] Schmidt, tome iv. p. 566. The greater part of the disputes, relative to the imperial elections, had been caused by the pretensions of all the princes in each family of the secular electors to give votes on

cession of the electors were determined, and the imperial elections were protected from the pretensions of the pontiffs, founded upon the divisions of the electors. In framing this regulation he was probably influenced by a desire of transferring the whole power of the empire by degrees to the electoral college[16], of which, as the king of Bohemia, he was himself a member; and for this purpose it seems that *the golden bull* proposed, that this college should be annually assembled.

In reference to the Bohemian movement of reformation, we find in the reign of this prince that, in the year 1349, a university was founded by him at Prague[17], in which John Huss, at the end of half a century, began his opposition to the church of Rome; and from the project which he announced, of reforming the clergy of Germany[18], we may conclude that in Bohemia, where he resided, he gave encouragement to those, who were ill affected to the existing order of the church. Charles IV., after a reign of thirty-one years, was in the year 1378 succeeded by his son Wenceslaus, also king of Bohemia, who twenty-two years afterwards was deposed from the imperial throne for neglect of the interests of the empire, while he continued to reign in his hereditary kingdom. To his government belong all the same characteristics, which have been ascribed to that of his father. Constantly residing in Bohemia, he like him neglected the affairs of the empire, when at length the confusions of the imperial government had broken out into open hostilities, he improved its arrangement by beginning, in the year 1387, the distribution of the empire into circles[19], which was completed after a hundred and twenty-five years by Maximilian I. Like his father too, he expressed an anxiety to reform the German clergy[20]; and when Huss began to preach against the abuses of the church, this prince afforded him encouragement[21] through resent-

the occasion. Charles ordained that the votes should be attached to the electoral states, which should be indivisible, and inherited according to priority of birth.—Schmidt, tome iv. p. 566. [16] Ibid., p. 570. [17] A university was founded at Vienna after the model of those of Paris and Prague, in the year 1364; and the university of Leipsic in the year 1409.—Pfeffel, tome i. pp. 529, 561. [18] Ibid., p. 526. [19] Ibid., p. 544. [20] Ibid., p. 538. [21] Coxe's Hist. of the House of Austria, vol. i. p. 173.

ment against the pontiff, by whose intrigues he had been deposed from the imperial dignity. Both the evil and the good qualities of this prince were favourable to the religious movement of Bohemia. While his carelessness and intemperance allowed a free opportunity to the adversaries of Rome[22], he was disposed by his integrity and understanding, for which his habits of ebriety have hindered him from obtaining sufficient credit, to countenance exertions so manifestly justified by the prevailing abuses[23].

The reign of this Bohemian emperor appears at the same time to have had one special bearing, as it afforded a convenient opportunity for the full establishment of the Swiss confederacy, which was effected ten years after he had been advanced to the throne of the empire, and twelve years before he was driven from it by an intrigue of one of the two pontiffs, who then divided the church[24].

Wenceslaus was succeeded in the imperial dignity by Robert, the elector-count palatine, who during ten years was, as Pfeffel has observed, but a phantom on the throne[25]. He died in the year 1410, and the deposed Wenceslaus, who survived him, enjoyed the satisfaction of seeing, that Germany had been even more disorganised under his government[26], as he had been forced to relinquish the distribution into circles begun by his predecessor.

Robert was, in the year 1410, succeeded on the throne of the empire by Sigismond king of Hungary, the brother of Wenceslaus, who resigned in his favour his own pretensions to the imperial dignity, and on whose death, which occurred nine years afterwards, he became also king of Bohemia. He had become king of Hungary in the year 1386, by his marriage with the heiress of that kingdom. The government of this prince favoured yet more the increasing relaxation of the empire. Occupied by a war with the Venetians, he even delayed for some years to take possession of his new dignity, and he was afterwards almost continually engaged in those ecclesiastical move-

[22] Coxe's Hist. of the House of Austria, vol. i. p. 172. [23] Pfeffel, tome i. pp. 538, 546. [24] Irritated by the loss of the support, which Wenceslaus had hitherto given him, he excited against the emperor the ecclesiastical electors, already dissatisfied with his constant residence in Bohemia.—Ibid., pp. 548, 549. [25] Ibid., p. 562. [26] Schmidt, tome v. p. 80.

ments, by which Christendom, and Germany in particular, was then agitated, as the great revolution of the sixteenth century became less distant. In his reign accordingly it began to be very difficult to assemble the imperial diet[27], the emperor himself rarely coming at the appointed time; and these assemblies lost much of their authority, when he adopted a practice of delegating commissioners to represent his person, or of summoning the states to meet in distant places, as at Vienna, or in Hungary.

The two kingdoms, which by the election of Sigismond became connected with the empire, were very differently circumstanced in regard to the church of Rome, Hungary, which he had long governed, being closely connected with the Roman see, and Bohemia, to which he afterwards succeeded, containing from early times principles of dissent and alienation.

The first introduction of the knowledge of Christianity into Hungary was the work of the policy of Charlemagne, by whom that country was reduced as far as the Raab. What was thus begun by the western emperor, was completed by Stephen duke of Hungary, who in the year 1000 assumed the royal, instead of the ducal title, and sought in the support of the Roman pontiff a confirmation of his new dignity. The pontiff, gratified by an application, which flattered his love of supremacy, rewarded the Hungarian prince with favours[28], which bound him and his successors to the support of the hierarchy, not only permitting the king of Hungary to cause a cross to be borne before him, in testimony of the apostolic character, but also granting to him the more substantial privilege of administering all the concerns of the Hungarian church, as the deputy of the papacy. In this country accordingly no principle of ecclesiastical separation existed, and the sovereign was even directly interested in maintaining the pretensions of the see of Rome, as delegated to himself. Hungary was at this time in its most prosperous condition,

[27] Schmidt, tome v. p. 202. [28] These were bestowed on the condition, that the kings of Hungary should have been approved by the pontiffs, which does not appear to have been observed, nor did the pontiffs judge it convenient to notice the neglect.—Révol. de Hongrie, liv. i. p. 6. Haye, 1739.

possessing[29], as dependent provinces, Dalmatia, Croatia, Servia, Transylvania, Ladomeria, Bulgaria, Bosnia, Moldavia, and Walachia.

Bohemia, on the other hand, received the first knowledge of Christianity from two Greek monks[30], sent into this country and Moravia by the empress Theodora, and her son the emperor Michael, about the middle of the ninth century. The first bishop of Prague was however received a century afterwards from Germany, by which event a connexion was begun with the church of Rome. In the eleventh century it appears that Bohemia was divided between the religious usages of the eastern and western churches, the communication with Germany bringing over the upper classes of society continually more and more to the church of Rome, while the common people adhered to that of Greece. At length, in the year 1176, the Waldenses[31], who even in that early and ignorant period protested against the gross and manifold abuses of a corrupted hierarchy, flying from the persecution of the French government, sought refuge in other parts of Europe, especially in Bohemia, where they were well received, and their doctrine made a considerable progress.

From this detail it appears that strong predispositions to a separation from the church of Rome existed in Bohemia. The Greek form of Christianity, which was first known among them, had habituated them to two practices, by which they were alienated from that church; they had been allowed to perform their worship in their own, which was the Sclavian language, and their laity[32] received the

[29] Révol. de Hongrie, liv. i. pp. 19—23. [30] Hist. de la Guerre des Hussites et du Concile de Basle, par Lenfant, tome i. liv. i.

[31] So named from the vallies of Piedmont, in which they had been long sheltered, and from which they spread into the adjacent provinces of France. [32] The ancient practice of communicating *under both kinds* began to be disused in the beginning of the twelfth century.—A Treatise of Liturgies by cardinal Bona, book ii. ch. xiii. quoted in the History of the Synod of Diamper by Geddes, Lond. 1694. A practice had very anciently prevailed of administering the wine to the laity through a pipe, which may have prepared the way for the greater distinction afterwards introduced.—Lenfant, tome i. pp. 13, 64. This was probably a consequence of the prevailing doctrine of transubstantiation, the bread being conceived to be sufficient, as being converted into the body of Christ.

wine with the bread in the celebration of the eucharist. The former of these usages had been abrogated by Gregory VII. in the year 1079, but probably the sacramental wine was not withdrawn from the laity of Bohemia until the middle of the fourteenth century, when the emperor Charles IV., having founded the university of Prague, invited to it the doctors of Germany, France, and Italy, and these declaimed against the practice of communicating *under both kinds*, as an error of the Greeks. The spirit of the Bohemians did not however sink under the injunctions of Rome, their ancient alienation from that church having been strengthened by the accession of the Waldenses; and even down to the time of John Huss they continued to celebrate the holy communion in their original manner, first in private houses, afterwards armed in the woods.

The reformer of Bohemia had been educated in the new university of Prague, of which he was afterwards constituted rector, but derived his principles of reformation from the writings of Wicliffe[33], which had been brought into that country from England by some Bohemian students, and were by Huss translated into the Bohemian language. Excited by his example, he began to preach against the corruptions of the clergy, and some of his followers inculcated the duty of communicating *under both kinds*, though Huss himself, while he held it to be legitimate and useful, appears not to have thought this absolutely necessary. The council of Constance[34], alarmed by tenets, which struck at the temporal greatness of the clergy, summoned Huss to appear before them; the reformer protected by the safe conduct of the emperor Sigismond, attended the assembly, to give an account of his doctrine; and in violation of that safe conduct, on the avowed principle that faith should not be observed with heretics[35], he was there

[33] Lenfant, liv. v. Rapin's Hist. of England, vol. i. p. 481. Wicliffe began to preach his doctrine of reformation in the year 1377, more than a century before Huss. [34] This council was convened in the year 1415 on account of the divisions of the papacy, there being then three pontiffs. Two of them were deposed, and the third resigned. The council elected a new pope. [35] This abominable principle was indeed limited to cases, in which the catholic faith, or the ecclesiastical jurisdiction, was concerned. — Schmidt, tome v. p. 142.

committed to the flames, as was also his friend Jerome of Prague in the succeeding year.

The perfidious violence practised against Huss served but to animate his followers; and when[36], three years afterwards, a papal legate visited Bohemia for the purpose of repressing them by force, the measure of their indignation was full, and Ziska, a Bohemian gentleman, undertook with an armed force[37] to avenge the deaths of the two reformers by a war waged against the clergy and the monks[38]. To provide a strong hold for his numerous partisans, he caused lines to be drawn round the summit of a mountain, which have been said[39] to be the first essay of the modern art of fortification; the mountain he named Tabor, in allusion to that mentioned by the same name in the sacred writings. The reformers of Bohemia were from this time a party animated to the utmost excesses of violence and cruelty, which continued to be practised in a war of fifteen years.

The doctrine of Huss does not appear to have been fitted to work a reformation in the church, however, by denouncing the corruption of the hierarchy, he may have prepared the way for other reformers better acquainted with their religion. It is certain, says the translator of Mosheim[40], that he adhered to the most superstitious tenets of the church of Rome, as appears by two sermons, which he had prepared for the council of Constance. It has been also stated[41] that, like Wicliffe, he taught that, not only a pope or bishop, but also a king, who lived in mortal sin, was divested of his character; a principle which drew from Sigismond the just observation, that no man is exempt from sin. The violences, in which his efforts terminated, must on the contrary have had the operation of confirming

[36] Lenfant, liv. vi. [37] Ziska, who was chamberlain to Wenceslaus, is said to have obtained from that unthinking prince a direct permission to wreak his vengeance.—Coxe's Hist. of the House of Austria, vol. i. p. 175. [38] Ziska is said to have destroyed five hundred and fifty churches and monasteries. Æneas Sylvius, though an Italian, declared his persuasion, that no other kingdom in Europe then possessed so many, so august, and so magnificent churches, which were found not merely in the cities and towns, but even in the villages.—Lenfant, tome i. pp. 103, 104. [39] Coxe's Hist. of the House of Austria, vol. i. p. 178. [40] Eccles. Hist. cent. xv. part ii. chap. ii. note. [41] Schmidt, tome v. p. 138.

in the cause of the hierarchy the sovereign, who beheld Bohemia the scene of these excesses. This seems to have been its direct and proper action. The empire, which had been through ages engaged in a mortal contest with the papacy, was at this time brought over to the cause of its ancient adversary, by the advancement of the king of Hungary to its throne, who had to encounter the intemperance of an ill-conceived project of reformation.

The ruin of the Hussites was chiefly effected by an original division of sentiment existing among themselves, which soon divided them into two parties, and enabled the church of Rome to acquire a superiority over both. The Calixtines[42], so denominated from the chalice, for the free participation of which in the eucharist[43] they chiefly contended, were not desirous of any particular change in the established religion, and were even disposed to be reconciled to the Roman pontiff: but the Taborites insisted that the papal authority should be entirely renounced, and that a new church should be formed, to be guided by divine impulse, asserting also the duty of inflicting an unrelenting vengeance on the adversaries of genuine religion, and maintaining that all temporal dominion was to be superseded by the immediate government of Jesus Christ. Of these two parties the former appears to have been derived from the Greek usages of the earlier church of Bohemia, the latter to have been formed of the fugitive Waldenses. Sigismond availed himself of their dissension to oppose one party to the other. The Hussites having been invited to send deputies to the council of Basle[44], for the purpose of effecting an accommodation, the invitation, which was rejected by the Taborites, was accepted by the Calixtines,

[42] Coxe's Hist. of the House of Austria, vol. i. p. 179. Lenfant, tome i. p. 137. [43] They were distinguished by four articles: 1, that the communion should be celebrated *under the two kinds;* 2, that the word of God should be freely preached; 3, that public crimes should be punished; 4, that ecclesiastics should not possess temporal goods.—Lenfant, tome i. p. 83. They appear to have agreed with the Roman Catholics in regard to the doctrines of transubstantiation and the sacrifice of the mass.—Ibid., tome ii. p. 121. The Taborites on the other hand explicitly rejected these doctrines, maintaining that the bread and wine, used in the eucharist, were merely signs of the body and blood of Jesus Christ.—Ibid. p. 134.

[44] Convened in the year 1431.

and these, having been indulged by the council in the general use of the sacramental cup, were enlisted against their former allies, who were by their assistance speedily reduced.

That this emperor should have been a king of Hungary had an important bearing, as it related to the progress of the Turkish power. Though the Turks had not yet crushed the eastern empire by the reduction of Constantinople, which was not taken until the year 1453, they began in the reign of Sigismond to make attempts on the provinces of that prince; and he was more than once occupied in combating them on the borders of Hungary. On these occasions the Turkish hostilities diverted him from acting against the insurgents of Bohemia[45], and thus allowed the religious dissensions of that country to proceed with less interruption. It will be seen that, in the reformation of Luther, the Protestants were critically favoured by the inroads of the same enemy, which then threatened the safety even of the empire.

As the Hussite war was concluded before the termination of the reign of Sigismond, the same reason did not continue to exist for the combination of Hungary and Bohemia with the imperial dignity; and accordingly they were both speedily detached, but not until they had formed a temporary connexion with the commencing dynasty of the Austrian princes, by which they might, after eighty-six years[46], become permanently dominions of the reigning family of Germany, when the extended and complicated combinations of the age of Charles V. should require such an arrangement of political interests. Albert II. duke of Austria, having married the daughter of Sigismond, who left no male issue, succeeded him in all his dignities. The reign of this emperor however did not quite comprehend two entire years, and served but to introduce to the throne of the empire that series of Austrian princes, by which it continued to be held to the year 1740[47]. Supported indeed

[45] Schmidt, tome v. pp. 146, 156. [46] In the year 1526, Louis II. king of Hungary and Bohemia having died without issue, the succession devolved to the archduke Ferdinand, in right of his marriage with a sister of that king, and of many treaties, which had anciently secured the inheritance to the house of Austria.—Pfeffel, tome ii. p. 134.

[47] Charles VI., who concluded the first house of Austria, died in

as this emperor was by the united strength of territories so considerable, and eminently endowed with the talents and virtues of a sovereign[48], he would probably have changed the character of the imperial government, if a premature death had not removed him from the throne in the second year of his reign. His transitory government accordingly was a mere commencement of a new dynasty. He was succeeded on the throne of the empire by his cousin, while a posthumous son, named Ladeslaus, became king of Hungary and Bohemia, and thus detached these kingdoms from the imperial dignity.

The remainder of the portion of German history, to be comprehended within this chapter, is occupied by the reigns of Frederic III. and Maximilian I., the former of whom enjoyed the imperial dignity fifty-three, the latter twenty-six years. In this interval was chiefly effected that improvement of the internal order of the imperial government, which had made some progress even while the combination of the government was gradually so relaxed, as almost to destroy its unity. In it was at length accomplished the abolition of the practice of private war[49],

the year 1740. Two years afterwards Charles Albert, elector of Bavaria, ascended the throne under the name of Charles VII. He died in the beginning of the year 1745, when the second house of Austria was begun by Francis of Lorraine, grand-duke of Tuscany, who had married Maria Theresa, daughter of Charles VI. and queen of Hungary and Bohemia. The short reign of Charles VII. was occupied by the war named the war of the succession. [48] Pfeffel, tome ii. p. 8. [49] 'This abuse was carried to so great an extent, that not only sovereigns and states engaged in hostilities from interest or revenge, but the lesser barons, and even associations of tradesmen and domestics, sent defiances to each other, on the most ridiculous pretences, and in a manner scarcely credible at the present day. We find a declaration of war from a private individual, Henry Mayenberg, against the emperor himself; another from the lord of Prauenstein against Frankfort, because a young lady of the city refused to dance with his uncle; another in 1450, from the baker and domestics of the margrave of Baden against Eslingen, Reutlingen, and other imperial cities; another in 1462, from the baker of the count palatine Louis against the cities of Augsburg, Ulm, and Rothwell; one in 1471, from the shoe-blacks of the university of Leipzig against the provost and some other members; and one in 1477, from a cook of Eppenstein with his scullions, dairy-maids, and dish-washers, against Otho count of Solens.'—Coxe's Hist. of the House of Austria, vol. i. p. 306.

a practice repugnant to the very conception of a political society, though it had been useful in maintaining the distinctness of the members of the empire; and the good order of the government was secured by the permanent establishment of an imperial chamber for the administration of justice[50], and by the completion of the distribution of the empire into its ten circles for the regulation of the police[51]. Nor was its importance confined to improvements of interior regulation. In the former of these two reigns, by the marriage of the son of Frederic with the heiress of Burgundy, the Low Countries with Franche Comté were acquired to the reigning family: and in the latter, by the marriage of the son of Maximilian with the heiress of Castile and Aragon, the immense possessions of the Spanish government were added to the other territories possessed by the princes of Austria.

A period thus doubly important to the empire formed an apt preparation for that great revolution of religion, which, while it rejected the abuses of a corrupted hierarchy, provided also the grand principle of political division, by which a federative system of policy was afterwards adjusted. Luther accordingly began the reformation two years before its conclusion. The adjustment however could not be effected before the peace of Westphalia, concluded in the year 1648.

The two emperors were well accomodated to the circumstances in which they respectively acted. Frederic III. has been described as a prince who loved tranquillity[52];

[50] This court was composed of a president, who was a prince or noble of the empire, and sixteen assessors, half of whom were of the equestrian order, and half doctors or licentiates in law, chosen by the emperor from candidates presented by the states. The members, for the first time in an institution of this kind, were declared to be not removeable from their offices. The jurisdiction of this tribunal was at first confined to appeals, but it gradually became more considerable, and produced the most beneficial effects.—Hist. of the House of Austria, vol. i. p. 350. [51] The circles were Austria, Burgundy, the Lower Rhine, Upper Saxony, Franconia, Bavaria, Suabia, Upper Rhine, Westphalia, and Lower Saxony. Four circles were formed in the reign of Wenceslaus; in the reign of Frederic III. they were increased to six; in that of Maximilian it was finally agreed that they should be the ten here mentioned.—Pfeffel, tome i. p. 544; tome ii. pp. 77, 96. [52] Schmidt, tome v. pp. 229, 230.

and the reign of such a prince, residing in a distant quarter of the empire, must have been particularly fitted to allow the public agitations to subside into repose without interruption from the sovereign. He spared indeed no exertions for the maintenance of peace; but in general he endeavoured to attain this end either by opposing one party of the turbulent to another, or by contriving to gain time. It has been remarked by Schmidt, that another plan of government, and an emperor of more power and activity[53], would have plunged Germany into anarchy and confusion. The restless activity of Maximilian, directed as it was to foreign enterprises, was on the other hand suited to prepare the foreign relations of the empire, when its domestic arrangements had been nearly reduced to order in the long reign of his father. Inconstant in his disposition, and ill supported by the empire, he was unsuccessful in his military efforts; but he managed his negotiations with ability, and, while he completed the plans of Frederic for securing the internal tranquillity of the government, he prepared the combinations of that importance in the system of Europe[54], which was asserted by the empire in the succeeding reign of Charles V.

The German constitution had, at the close of this period, received all the adjustment, of which it appears to have been susceptible, consistently with a close approximation to the character of a federative association of states. The arrangement of the diets had been regulated by its distribution into the three distinct colleges, of electors, of princes, and of imperial cities: the number and the rights of the electors had been ascertained by the *golden bull:* the interior tranquillity of the empire was at length secured by the abolition of private war, by the permanent establishment of the imperial chamber, and by the division of the circles:

[53] He possessed only Styria, Carinthia, and Carniola, which formed scarcely the half of the Austrian territories.—Schmidt, tome v. p. 231. [54] Of this prince, Mr. Coxe has observed that, 'though too much depreciated by modern historians (in a note he has particularised Robertson, Hume, and Roscoe) who seem only to have discerned his failings, his misfortunes, and his wants, he rose superior to his age by his multifarious endowments of body and mind, and was the wonder, the boast, and the envy of his contemporaries.'—Hist. of the House of Austria, vol. i. p. 443.

and it had become an established practice, that the emperors should always be chosen from the same family. This practice, by which the crown became in effect hereditary, was begun by Charles IV., who in the year 1376 procured his son Wenceslaus to be elected king of the Romans[55]. It was favoured by the ruin of the finances, which created a necessity of choosing an emperor, who should be enabled by his own resources to maintain his dignity.

In this adjustment indeed there was much imperfection and irregularity. The feudal constitution of the German government limited the admission of the representatives of cities into the councils of the empire to those, which were subject to the imperial authority, leaving without any representation the other cities, and the remainder of the commons, though forming a body infinitely more numerous. This mischief was however in some degree corrected by a similar irregularity, affecting the electoral college, and hindering it from engrossing the government. There were families not comprehended among the electors, which were much more considerable than those included in the electoral college; and Bohemia, which possessed an importance superior to that of any other electorate, declined after the reign of Charles IV., on account of the troubles occasioned by the preaching of Huss.

The government of the empire was in truth[56], not so much a single polity, as an assemblage of various powers, allied by treaties, and connected by continued negotiations in a congress always subsisting. It was therefore essential to it, that the combination should be imperfect and irregular, for a more perfect adjustment must have tended to reduce it to the form of a single polity, and to destroy its federative character. Loosely combined as it was, it was

[55] This was effected by bribery. Each of the four electors of the province of the Rhine, received one hundred thousand florins of gold, which sums were levied on the small remains of the demesnes of the empire and on the imperial cities.—Pfeffel, tome i. p. 533.

[56] Observ. sur l'Hist. de France par Mably, liv. iv. ch. vi. Germany, at the death of the emperor Sigismond, was bounded on the south by the Alps and the Rhine; on the north by the Baltic, the Eyder, and the German ocean; on the west by Mount Jura, the Voges, and the Meuse; and on the east by precisely the same limits as at present.

beyond all others fitted to propagate among the independent governments of Europe those relations of international policy, which have procured for the entire assemblage the collective appellation of the European republic, as if they formed a single community, however composed of numerous and heterogeneous members. The slight combination of the empire was little closer and more compact than the diplomacy of independent states; and the several parts of a constitution so imperfectly connected could easily enter into separate engagements with foreign nations, by which these should be involved in the relations of a federative and balanced system.

CHAPTER III.

Of the history of Swisserland, from the conspiracy in the year 1307, *to the admission of Appenzel, the last of the thirteen cantons, in the year* 1513.

Conspiracy of the three forest-cantons in the year 1307—Lucern admitted, 1332—Zuric admitted, 1351—Glaris and Zug admitted, 1352—Berne admitted, 1353—War of the nobles, 1386—The nobles reduced, 1389—The League of the House of God, 1396—The Grey League, 1424—The League of the Ten Jurisdictions, 1428—The Burgundian war begun, 1474—concluded, 1477—Friburg and Soleure admitted, 1481—The Swiss confederacy independent, 1500—Basle and Schaffhausen admitted, 1501—Appenzel admitted, 1513.

HISTORIANS have agreed in remarking the geographical peculiarities, by which the Swiss have been separated from the surrounding nations, and as it were destined to the formation of a confederacy of republics. Bounded[1] by the Alps and the lake of Geneva on the south, by Mount Jura

[1] Swisserland in length, from east to west, extends about two hundred British miles, and in breadth, from north to south, about one hundred and thirty. The area has been estimated to contain fourteen thousand nine hundred and sixty square miles. The population does not exceed one million eight hundred thousand persons, a large proportion of the territory being unfit for human habitation.—Pinkerton's Modern Geogr., vol. i. p. 566. Planta's Hist. of the Helvetic Confederacy, vol. i. p. 4. Lond. 1800.

on the west, and by the Rhine on the north and east, they were taught by nature to consider themselves a distinct community, while the almost inaccessible mountains, which broke into subdivisions the interior country, still more forcibly determined them to the distribution of that community among a number of republics, acknowledging a federal connexion, but tenacious of independence. The Helvetians accordingly are known to have formed in the most ancient times a distinct nation, which was distributed into four districts, their less settled habits having probably hindered a more minute division. The conquering power of Rome indeed overthrew the independence of the Helvetians by him, who afterwards became her own master; and, when the Roman empire itself had sunk under the unwieldiness of a wide dominion, and the shocks of barbarian invasion, they were successively subjected to the Burgundians, the Franks, the Lombards, and the Germans, and even their ancient name was forgotten and lost. At length, when the modern governments of Europe began to assume settled and appropriate forms, the physical character of the country resumed its influence on the political condition of the people. Some of the tribes, by which it was inhabited, began to enjoy an obscure and unacknowledged independence in their secluded valleys; and that federal union of distinct cantons was insensibly adopted, which afterwards by successive extensions became the constitution of the entire country.

A political combination such as the Helvetic confederacy, could not be formed in the centre of Europe, without exercising by its mere example a direct and important influence on the surrounding governments. The example of freedom, which the policy[2] of ancient Rome had deemed so dangerous, could not be perpetually exhibited to the neighbouring nations, without exciting in them some disposition to vindicate the violated rights of the inferior classes of society; and the little republic of Geneva, which may be considered as an emanation flowing from the independence

[2] Idque etiam adversus Britanniam profuturum, si Romana ubique arma, et velut e conspectu libertas tolleretur, was one of the considerations, which disposed Agricola to undertake the conquest of Ireland. —Vita Agric. cap. xxiv.

of Swisserland, was, we know, to revolutionary France a principle of explosion, placed at its extremity, as the *fuse* is on the surface of the bomb. Even the military usages of these simple mountaineers produced an important effect in modifying the general system. Destitute of cavalry, which their poverty and the barrenness of their territory rendered it impossible to provide, they trusted to the prowess of a hardy infantry; and their example taught the neighbouring governments to disregard the military service of the nobles, who, as horsemen, had constituted the strength of the armies of Europe.

But the most interesting function of this interesting confederacy appears to have consisted in providing a fit theatre for that part of the reformation of religion, which has received its name from the ancient denomination of the country. It was only amidst the freedom of the little communities, of which this confederacy was composed, that a revolution of religion could occur, which should introduce the laity into the management of the church. Though such a revolution might perhaps have been accomplished amidst the equality of one large democracy, the ecclesiastical equality so established would probably have been as transient, as political equality must be in a considerable state, for some demagogue, who had raised himself to power, would be eager to crush the institutions, by which he had been elevated. All the governments of the Helvetic confederacy indeed did not embrace the reformed religion, nor even those, in which the principle of equal government chiefly prevailed; but it may be easily understood that, for maintaining the spirit of the Helvetic reformation, a balance of contending governments may have been required. The human mind is in every case excited by opposition to the exertion of its energies, and at the same time restrained from their excesses. A system of ecclesiastical freedom required therefore to be supported by the countervailing principle of popery, existing in seven of the thirteen cantons[3]; and the confederacy thus exhibited, in regard to religion, a miniature of the balance existing in the general system of Europe, except that in the former

[3] Schwitz, Uri, Underwalden, Lucern, Zug, Glaris, and Appenzel. —Planta, vol. ii. p. 143.

the party of the Protestants prevailed, in the latter that of the Roman Catholics.

Though however the confederacy of the Swiss cantons constituted the fittest organ, for forming and maintaining the Helvetic reformation, the little republic of Geneva. adjacent to, but not comprehended within the limits of Swisserland, possessed some peculiar advantages, by which it was qualified to give extraordinary energy to the spirit, which had been nurtured among the Swiss. Driven into independence[4] in escaping from the double tyranny of the count of Savoy and of its own bishop, its people were naturally disposed to resist every pretension at once of ecclesiastical and of civil authority, and to frame a code of republican regulation for the management of concerns, religious as well as temporal. The republic too being so very diminutive[5], that every citizen was conscious of bearing a considerable proportion to the entire community, the spirit of ecclesiastical and civil independence was not mitigated by

[4] They were not however driven into democracy, for the difficulties of its situation rendered the steady prudence of an aristocracy necessary even to their existence. It was accordingly determined, in the year 1530, that the members of each of the two councils, the petty council and the council of two hundred, should be nominated by the other.—Hist. de Génève par M. Spon, tome i. p. 202, note. Généve, 1730. From this time the two councils formed a permanent aristocracy, which maintained the interest of the little community; but the remote result was that a strong reaction was at length excited, which, through a great part of the eighteenth century, rendered Geneva a scene of democratical agitation. The first effort of resistance was exerted in the year 1707. In the year 1738 an edict of pacification was framed by the mediation of France and of the two Swiss cantons of Zuric and Berne. The struggle was renewed in the year 1760, on the arrival of Rousseau, who came to reside in the republic, and was terminated in the year 1768 by an ordinance of mutual accommodation. This ordinance was observed during twelve years; but in the year 1780 the aristocratic party endeavoured to recover their ascendency, and new contentions prepared materials of disorder, which soon afterwards assisted in effecting the disorganization of France and Europe.—Hist. and Polit. View of the Const. and Revol. of Geneva by D'Ivernois. Dublin, 1784. [5] The population of the city of Geneva does not exceed twenty-five thousand persons.—Pinkerton, vol. i. p. 575. It is said however to have contained two hundred houses more in the fifteenth century.—Planta, vol. i. p. 333. The scanty and scattered territory did not, in the time of D'Alembert, consist of thirty villages.—Essay on the Gov. of Geneva.

any of those causes, which operate in larger societies to moderate the violence of party. Moreover, as it stood detached[6] from the Helvetic confederacy, it was not restrained in its interior policy by any compromise of federative interests, but left at liberty to obey the impulse of its own agitations, while it was so constantly alarmed for its safety by the formidable power of the neighbouring governments, that every principle of activity was perpetually excited.

In the distribution of[7] the various parts of the Helvetic confederacy, a curious adjustment has been noticed by a recent writer[8]. The religion of Rome, he remarks, prevailed in those cantons, in which civil liberty had been carried into the extreme of democracy, while the subordination of the aristocratic cantons was tempered by the independence of ecclesiastical equality. This double combination was the result of the variety of local circumstances, the same mountainous situation, which was favourable to civil freedom, being adverse to the intellectual improvement necessary for religious reformation, and the inhabitants of the more level districts being at once disposed to form a more graduated arrangement of society, and qualified to discover and reject the abuses of the religion of Rome. While ecclesiastical was thus balanced against civil freedom, the difference in the political constitutions of the cantons was accommodated to the external relations of the confederacy, the democratic cantons being opposed to Austria, the great antagonist of Helvetic independence; and the aristocratic, which were better fitted for entering into amicable relations with France, being situated in the vicinity of that kingdom. The locality also of the little republic of Geneva, the Rome of protestantism, as it has

[6] It was separated from the confederacy not only by the lake, but also by the Pays de Vaud, which was not conquered from the duke of Savoy by the canton of Berne, before the year 1536.—Hist. des Suisses par Mallet, tome iii. p. 246. Génève, 1803. [7] Its governments not only varied through the forms of republican administration, from the democracy of the simple forest-cantons to the aristocracy of the powerful state of Berne, but even comprehended one instance of a principality, the counts of Neuchatel having retained their hereditary dominions within its limits, though not acknowledged as distinct members of the league. [8] Mém. de Louis XVI. par Soulavie, tome iii. p. 319, &c. Paris, 1801.

been elsewhere not unaptly denominated by the same writer, has attracted his observation, the Pays de Vaud, a district deprived of its liberty and subjected by Berne to a military government, being interposed between this seat of independence and the nearest canton, as a sort of moral non-conductor, which should intercept the communication of its influences.

The Helvetic reformation began in Zuric, and received its chief support from this flourishing canton, and from Berne, the most considerable of the states of Swisserland. If then we regard this part of the general reformation of religion as a grand object of the Helvetic confederacy, we shall be disposed to refer all its arrangements to the due modification of these two powerful cantons, seeking in the history of the rest only the instrumentality of subordinate members of the general combination. Placed on the contrary sides of the forest-cantons, which contained the germ of the confederacy, Zuric and Berne seem to have been the organs, by which its nobler functions were performed, deriving however the principle of their activity from the ruder mountaineers of the intermediate districts. Nor does it appear difficult to explain, why both should have been employed, the former in beginning, the latter in maintaining the Helvetic reformation. To originate this revolution of religion seems to have required that the canton, in which it should have its beginning, should incline towards a democracy, such as were the more northern members of the confederacy, whereas to support it demanded the vigour of a more considerable state, which should be governed by the steady wisdom of an aristocracy. When indeed the character of the Helvetic reformation had been sufficiently matured, it might be transmitted to the exterior apparatus, provided in the little community of Geneva, in which it might be perfected, and from which it might be most commodiously communicated to the neighbouring monarchy of France.

The tribe of Schwitz, which has given both a beginning and a name to this celebrated confederacy, was, even to the beginning of the eleventh century, so little known[9], that a neighbouring abbot, when he obtained some grants

[9] Planta, vol. i. p. 83. Mallet, tome i. p. 172.

of territory from the emperor, found it practicable to conceal its existence. But, though obscure, the people of this tribe were so little dependent on the empire, that we find them in the year 1240 soliciting its protection, as necessary to the due administration of justice[10]. Before this time, however, and even in the middle of the preceding century[11], the gradual diffusion of this tribe through the neighbouring vallies had caused it to be divided into three cantons, one of which retained the original appellation, and the others were distinguished by those of Uri and Underwalden; and the habits of political connexion, which naturally subsisted among these kindred communities, had even then given a commencement to the Helvetic confederacy.

The distinct existence of the confederacy, as a separate and acknowledged member of the general system of European states, was however yet far distant. Even the celebrated conspiracy in the beginning of the fourteenth century, from which its independence is commonly dated, professed only to be a renewal of the ancient league, and scrupulously reserved the rights of the house of Austria; and though, at the peace of Basle, concluded in the year 1500, the independence of the confederacy was virtually acknowledged by that family, it was found to be necessary to procure a solemn recognition of it at the peace of Westphalia[12], concluded in the year 1648, by which it became a part of the public law of Europe.

As the tribe of Schwitz, which originated the confederacy, received its peculiar spirit and character from the wild hardihood of its mountainous situation, so may the civil and ecclesiastical importance of Zuric and Berne, the parent and the protector of the Helvetic reformation, be distinctly traced to the local circumstances, in which these communities had been respectively formed. Zuric was by its position rendered a second time the emporium of Italy, Rhætia, and Germany[13], and it soon acquired the dignity and independence, which naturally result from commercial

[10] Planta, vol. i. pp. 85—87. [11] Ibid., p. 90. [12] Art. vi. of the treaty of Osnaburgh. Even in this however the Austrian diplomatists endeavoured to save the credit of their government by inserting a qualifying *quasi*. [13] Planta, vol. i. p. 72.

prosperity. Here accordingly Arnold of Brescia sought refuge in the twelfth century, when he was persecuted for arraigning the corruptions of the clergy; and the people of Zuric continued to cherish opinions, which tended to emancipate them from the dominion of the church of Rome. Berne, which had been founded towards the end of the twelfth century[14], was at once favoured by the advantage of a central situation, and alarmed into caution by its exposure. To the former circumstance it was indebted for a considerable degree of prosperity, and from the latter it derived that prudent policy, which even from its commencement rendered its government aristocratic, and gave to its counsels a superior wisdom[15]. The cautious policy of the people of Berne might probably for ever have disqualified them for commencing a revolution of religion; but they possessed sufficient independence to be disposed to receive the new doctrine from the democracy of Zuric. Their wisdom was then employed in the maintenance of the system, which had been formed among the bolder politicians of the more republican canton.

The advancement of Rodolph of Hapsburgh to the throne of the empire, which occurred in the year 1273, exercised an important influence on the fortunes of the confederacy. This Helvetic noble, having before his elevation acquired by his talents and conduct the advocacy, or protectorship, of several of the tribes of his country, and having after that event received from his countrymen in his numerous enterprises the most faithful service, was lavish in the proofs of the esteem and gratitude, which he felt for the little communities of Helvetia, particularly for the three cantons of Schwitz, Uri, and Underwalden[16]. His policy too had concurred with his gratitude to favour the growing independence of the commons of Swisserland, for in the early part of his career he had laboured to repress the licentiousness of the nobles, who tyrannised over the inferior orders. Even when he afterwards engaged in an enterprise of selfish ambition, this part also of his conduct was eventually conducive to the prosperity of the Hel-

[14] Planta, vol. i. p. 76. [15] Ibid. p. 95. [16] These he exempted from all dependence on his officers, and enjoined that their country should never on any account be pledged, or alienated, to any person. —Mallet, tome i. p. 178.

vetian states. The counts of Savoy having obtained as great an ascendency in the Roman or southern, as Rodolph had acquired in the Germanic part of Helvetia[17], it was natural that princes so circumstanced should on some occasion or other come into collision; and, as Rodolph conceived the project of re-establishing, in favour of his second son, the ancient kingdom of Burgundy[18], he was in the prosecution of it involved in a war with Savoy. If the design of Rodolph had been accomplished, his success must have crushed the republican spirit of Swisserland, by including that country within the limits of a considerable monarchy; but the accidental death of the young prince defeated the plan, and the result of the efforts of Rodolph, instead of establishing a dominion inconsistent with that spirit, was that the power of a formidable neighbour of the Helvetians was reduced, and that the several castles and demesnes were recovered, which had been taken from their territory.

Rodolph, who died in the year 1291, was succeeded on the throne of the empire by Adolphus count of Nassau, Albert the son of Rodolph having been rejected on account of the aversion generally entertained for his violent and ambitious character. The reign of Adolphus, though it was extended only to six years, formed an interval most favourable to the prosperity of Helvetia, both by the direct, and by the indirect operation of his government. Its direct operation bestowed on the cities, not only the confirmation of their ancient privileges[19], but also various additional and more important franchises; and, as the advancement of Adolphus was a temporary rejection of the pretension of Albert, it served to encourage among the Helvetic tribes that spirit of resistance, which broke out into action in the year 1307, when the latter had at length obtained possession of the throne. Such indeed was the

[17] Planta, vol. i. pp. 123, &c.

[18] The territories, which had belonged to this kingdom, were then possessed by the counts of Burgundy and other powerful vassals. The counts of Savoy had become masters of a part of the Pays de Vaud; the counts of Geneva possessed another; and Rodolph himself was endeavouring to extend his power in the landgraviate of Burgundy, which had been bequeathed to his family by the last count of Kyburg.—Mallet, tome i. p. 182.

[19] Planta, vol. i. p. 139.

apprehension of the tyranny of Albert, that, as soon as intelligence had been received of the death of his father Rodolph, the three cantons, Schwitz, Uri, and Underwalden, deemed it expedient to make a formal renewal of their ancient league[20], by which, while they reserved the duties, to which they had been subject, they bound themselves to receive no magistrates, except those who were natives of their country, and resident among them. Though the immediate alarm was dissipated by the elevation of Adolphus, it was remembered that Albert might yet be emperor. The intervening reign was accordingly employed in forming combinations against his pretensions; and, when this prince had at length defeated and slain his rival, and had taken possession of the throne, the Swiss received a sovereign, to whom they had been enemies.

When the deputies of the Swiss, in the year 1298, repaired to Albert after his election, they received from him a denunciation, well fitted to justify the apprehensions, which they had conceived, being informed that he designed soon to propose an alteration of their government. Anxious to possess himself of all the districts[21], which intervened between his hereditary dominions, he immediately adopted measures for the execution of this purpose, assuming to himself various supremacies and jurisdictions, and at length summoning the inhabitants of the three cantons to submit themselves wholly to his direction. The cantons, though required to surrender all their privileges, contented themselves with declining to make any change in the condition, which they had inherited from their fathers, and soliciting a confirmation of their ancient liberties; but the commissaries or bailiffs, deputed by Albert for the administration of justice, irritated the people by their insults and oppressions, and a combination of three intrepid individuals[22], inhabitants respectively of the three original cantons, gave, in the year 1307, a beginning to the Helvetic nation. Notwithstanding the provocations, which they had received, the conduct of these men and their associates was distinguished

[20] This is the oldest document of the Swiss confederacy. It is dated in the year 1291.— Planta, vol. i. p. 134, note. [21] Ibid., pp. 145, &c. [22] Walter Furst of Uri, Warner Stauffacher of Schwitz, and Arnold of Underwalden.

by moderation and justice. When one of the two imperial bailiffs had fallen a victim to the revenge of an individual, the celebrated William Tell, whom he had particularly outraged[23], the other and all his attendants were quietly conducted to the frontiers, and were dismissed in safety, as soon as they had bound themselves by an oath never again to visit the territory of the cantons. The rights of the cantons had been vindicated, and the shepherds of the Alps meditated no political innovation.

While Albert was marching against the Swiss, to crush this spirit of resistance, however moderated, he perished by the hands of assassins, supposed to have been instigated by his own nephew, and left the confederacy to be cemented and extended. But it is deserving of attention that the circumstances of his death, though the Swiss had no concern in the violence, proved eminently favourable to the republican character of the cantons. The succeeding emperor gave his assistance to the family of Albert in punishing the assassins; and the persecution of the nobles, who were believed to have been engaged in the conspiracy, has been regarded as having contributed more than all the subsequent wars[24], to the destruction of the nobility in this part of Helvetia.

If we now pursue the progress of this interesting confederacy, we shall observe a various combination of circumstances, by which it was assisted. The Austrian family, the advancement of which had first promoted the prosperity, and then provoked the assistance of the cantons, was set aside by the electors of the empire at the death of Albert, and Henry VII., a prince not at all connected with that family, was placed upon the throne. This emperor feeling no interest in the resentments of the Austrian princes, did

[23] William Tell, son-in-law to Walter Furst, had offended the bailiff by refusing with scorn to pay obeisance to a hat planted on a pole. On this account he was seized, and in violation of the privilege of his canton placed in a boat, to be conveyed across the lake; but, a storm having arisen, Tell, who had been loosed from his fetters that he might navigate the vessel, found an opportunity of effecting his escape, and afterwards, meeting his enemy in a hollow way, shot him with an arrow. The popular tale of the apple of which, when placed on the head of his son, Tell is said to have been ordered to shoot, is not mentioned by Muller the historian of Swisserland.—Planta, vol. i. pp. 154, 155. [24] Mallet, tome i. p. 219.

justice to the conduct of the cantons[25], and in particular declared them exempt from the jurisdiction of Austria, to which they had been subject. Four years afterwards, the imperial throne having become vacant by the death of Henry, the competition for the succession, which arose between Louis of Bavaria and Frederic of Austria, afforded the occasion of the struggle, by which the confederacy of the cantons was established. The cantons attached themselves to Louis, the rival of the Austrian prince, and, being on that account attacked by the Austrians, fought in the year 1315, or eight years after their solemn confederation, the decisive battle of Morgarten. In this conflict occurred a display of political firmness and of steady patriotism, which reminds us of the best days of ancient virtue, and is honourably characteristic of the founders of the Helvetic league. Fifty men, who in some civil dissension had been banished from the canton of Schwitz, solicited permission to fight on this important day in defence of their native seat; the magistrates however refused to suffer the apprehension of danger to be admitted as a reason for relaxing the ordinances of their country, and declined to accept the patriotic proposal; and the exiles, though rejected by their countrymen, posted themselves on an eminence beyond the frontier of the canton, where they contributed to the victory of those, by whom their offered service had been refused. The people of the canton then gave to gratitude, what they had declined to yield to apprehension, and the exiles were restored immediately after the battle.

The next important event in the history of the confederacy was the admission of Lucern as a fourth canton, which occurred in the year 1332[26], the twenty-fifth since the three primitive cantons had associated for the preservation of their rights. The tyrannical habits of the Austrian family were the cause of this accession, as they had given occasion to the original resistance of the three cantons. Though the people of Lucern had, in the contest for the throne of the empire, attached themselves to the family of Austria, they were not thereby exempted from its oppressions. Wearied at length of the sacrifices, which they had made, and indignant at the neglect and tyranny, which

[25] Planta, vol. i. pp. 176, &c. [26] Ibid., pp. 191, &c.

they experienced, they solicited to be admitted into the league of the cantons, as the only asylum of their rights. In this extension of the confederacy the claims of justice were observed as scrupulously, as in the original association, the rights of the house of Austria being reserved inviolate, and the municipal government being left unaltered. A conspiracy however, formed by the nobles of Lucern, who were adverse to this measure, gave occasion to a change of government, by which this was more nearly assimilated to the earlier cantons, for, the conspiracy having been accidentally discovered, the administration, which had been chiefly conducted by a few patrician families, was in all lesser matters transferred to a numerous council of burghers, and in those of greater importance vested in the whole community. The dukes of Austria, exhausted by their Bohemian and other wars, or conciliated by the moderation of the confederates, were induced to acquiesce in the extension of the league to this additional canton.

Though the confederacy began thus to comprehend other cantons, yet the three original tribes of Schwitz, Uri, and Underwalden, which have been distinguished by the appellation of the forest-cantons, ever preserved a connexion of peculiar intimacy[27], and indeed constituted the bond, by which the whole confederacy was united, as they alone were alike connected with all the members of the Helvetic league[28]. This little association was the central principle, which diffused the life of freedom through all the organisation of the larger alliance, and the name of that particular tribe, which had been distributed into these three cantons, was gradually adopted as the collective name of the nation.

Lucern was an important accession to the forest-cantons, as it communicated with these by the lake, which they surrounded, being situated at its other extremity, and with a portion of Germany by three rivers, the Reuss, the Aar, and the Rhine. But much the most considerable of the accessory members of the league were Zuric and Berne, the two principal of the protestant cantons of Swisserland.

[27] Planta, vol. i. p. 263. Mallet, tome ii. p. 90. [28] There was no immediate compact between Berne, Zuric, and Lucern; none between Berne, Glaris, and Zug; and Glaris and Lucern were equally unconnected.—Planta, vol. i. p. 263.

These indeed appear to have been the organs, for which the entire system was constructed, the other parts of the confederacy serving either, as the forest-cantons, to furnish these two with the active energy of Swiss independence, or else to maintain that equilibrium of the religious parties of the country, by which the zeal of these protestant cantons was preserved in a state of sufficient excitement. Of Berne in particular it has been observed by a recent historian of the confederacy[29] that, even before the alliance of the three original cantons, it was become the grand protector of the Helvetic states, and that, if this state had perished in a particular crisis of its fortune, the Helvetic confederacy probably would never have had a place in the annals of the human species. The accession of these two cantons, together with that of Glaris and Zug, occurred about twenty years after Lucern had been added to the alliance of the forest-cantons.

The democratic constitution of Zuric[30] having been subverted by the intrigues of one of the citizens, a conspiracy was formed against the usurper, but, having been accidentally discovered, was frustrated. The vindictive proceedings of the usurper against the abettors of the conspiracy, involved a neighbouring noble connected with Austria, and thus engaged the duke in the quarrel; and the hostilities of Austria, rendered it expedient for Zuric and Glaris to solicit to be admitted into the Swiss confederacy, that they might obtain its protection against an enemy so formidable. When these two cantons had thus been added to the union, Zug[31] was, for the general safety, in some degree compelled to enrol itself in the confederacy. Berne, which had been obliged to act against the league, was then invited[32] to become a member, that it might not again by other alliances be forced to array itself against the neighbouring cantons.

During one hundred and twenty-five years[33] the confederacy was limited to these, which have been distinguished by the name of the eight ancient cantons, the accession of the last of which, the great canton of Berne, had now given to it, not only a considerable augmentation of strength, but

[29] Planta, vol., i. pp. 140, 214. [30] Ibid., pp. 204—243.
[31] Ibid., p. 247. [32] Ibid., p. 250. [33] Mallet, tome i. p. 298.

also a more stable combination in its internal structure, and a greater importance in its foreign estimation. But it must not be conceived, that any great degree of political union was the object of the confederacy. The original principle was merely the preservation of ancient rights, in opposition to the aggressions of princes and nobles; the alliances among its members were by no means uniform and equal, many of the five later cantons being connected only through the intervention of the general alliance, while the three original cantons always maintained an intimate association; and the conferences, from which the Helvetic diets afterwards arose, were originally but occasional meetings on the frontiers, suggested by some consideration of present expediency. Composed of members differing much in magnitude, in structure, and in strength, and loosely combined in the various conditions of alliance, it was rather a federative system of distinct communities, than an incorporation into one national government.

As the tendency of the confederacy was plainly to wrest the supreme authority from the great lords and princes, and to transfer it to the people, it might well be imagined that the former would at length be so roused to a conviction of their danger, that they would associate together for one desperate struggle against the continually increasing power of the enemy. Such an effort appears accordingly to have been made within a few years after the great enlargement of the confederacy, which about the same time added four new cantons, the war of the nobles having been begun in the year 1386, when the confederates[34] were assailed by one hundred and sixty-seven lords, headed by the duke of Austria. This war however served to establish that power, which it proposed to overthrow, and to decide and hasten the ruin of the nobility of Swisserland. When it had raged three years, during which the cantons had been almost uniformly successful, a peace was concluded, the nobles having been much reduced, and the Austrians being then engaged in a war with Poland. The enemies of the confederacy were at this time diminished in number and reduced in resources[35]; its members were disciplined to

[34] Planta, vol. i. p. 293. [35] Various divisions of their possessions had been occasioned by accidental occurrences.—Ibid., p. 332.

mutual co-operation by the necessity of opposing an united resistance to a common danger; and besides the conquests achieved by Berne in the progress of the war, the Helvetic cities in general enjoyed a favourable opportunity of effecting various acquisitions by civil contracts. The influence of the war of the nobles, in strengthening the union of the confederacy, appears in the formation of the decree of Sempach, the first martial law of the Swiss nation, which was framed four years after the conclusion of the peace, and received its name from the decisive engagement[36], which had terminated the contest.

Thus, in less than a century, the confederacy, which had been begun among the shepherds of the three original cantons, was extended through almost every part of the Helvetic territory, comprehended among its members some considerable cities, and had become possessed of a number of dependent territories[37]. The acquisition of territorial dependencies was indeed a great deviation from the practice of the original association; but it was a change of plan[38] rendered necessary by the general change of political society. As the nobles of Europe sunk into decay, the princes had recourse to stipendiary forces, instead of those furnished by the feudal service, and with these would soon have overwhelmed the Helvetic cities, if the latter had not acquired a countervailing force, by possessing themselves of a considerable extent of surrounding territory.

The Helvetic confederacy was not the only association

[36] In this engagement the victory was gained by an heroic act of patriotism, which ought to be for ever remembered among instances of the most generous self-devotement. When the confederates had failed in every attempt to break the line of their enemies, Arnold Struthan de Winkelried, a knight of Underwalden, cried to his countrymen that he would open a passage, desiring them to provide for his wife and children, and to honour his race; then throwing himself on the pikes of the opposite ranks, grasped as many of them as he could, buried them in his bosom, and bore them to the ground, leaving a space open for the advance of his companions.—Planta, vol. i. p. 300.

[37] This practice was afterwards much extended by the canton of Berne, which acquired in the year 1536 all the Pays de Vaud.—Spon, tome i. pp. 270, 305. This tract of country, the most agreeable and the most fertile of southern Swisserland, extends in length about twenty leagues, and is almost equally broad.—Mallet, tome iii. p. 235.

[38] Planta, vol. i. p. 328.

formed in these Alpine countries for the security of independence. Encouraged by its prosperous establishment, three other leagues were concluded in the districts, which bordered the eastern side of the Helvetic territory. The earliest of these was named the league of the house of God, because most of its members were dependent on the metropolitan church of Coire; the second was denominated the grey league, probably[39] from the colour of the simple dresses of those, by whom it was originally formed; and the third was distinguished by the title of the league of the ten jurisdictions. The commencement of the first[40] has been referred to the year 1396, that of the second to the year 1424, and that of the third to the year 1428.

When the Helvetic league had been so extended, that it comprehended many members very variously circumstanced, it was inevitable that some internal agitation should occur, before the parts of this heterogeneous assemblage could be in any degree adjusted among themselves, especially as their union was not longer strengthened by the apprehension of external danger. The first instance[41] of the difficulty of reconciling the various interests and pretensions of the members of the confederacy, which occurred in the year 1416, related to a district on the frontier of Italy, the people of which solicited assistance in an insurrection from two neighbouring cantons, while the chief magistrate, as a co-burgher of Berne, applied himself to that powerful community for support. In this instance the cantons, though they espoused opposite parties, did not proceed to hostilities, but agreed upon an accommodation. In the year 1440 however, the male line[42] of a noble family of Helvetia having become extinct, and the last male having died intestate, a war broke out among the cantons concerning the claims to the possessions of the family, and continued to desolate them during seven years. But this bloody and protracted contention[43] served to establish two principles, which formed the chief support of the confederation; that

[39] Or from the ancient appellation of this group of mountains, Alpes Graiæ. The whole of Upper Rhætia has since derived from the name of this league the appellation of Grisones, or the *Grey Ones*.—Mallet, tome iii. p. 404. [40] Planta, vol. i. pp. 339, 404, 405. [41] Ibid., p. 385. [42] Ibid., pp. 409, &c. [43] Mallet, tome ii. p. 89.

every disagreement, which might arise among the cantons should be referred to the judgment of those, which were neutral, and that the confederate cantons had a right to determine, whether alliances severally contracted by the members of the league were compatible with the general association. It is deserving of attention, that the emperor[44] was at this time too deeply engaged in war with the Turks, the Hussites, and many of his own subjects, to interfere with any effect in the Helvetic contest.

It has been mentioned that one important respect, in which the Helvetic confederacy influenced the system of Europe, was that of the change effected in the military art, when the states of Europe were taught by the example of the Swiss to rely on the steadiness of infantry, rather than on the impetuosity of cavalry. This influence was exerted in the practice latterly adopted by the Swiss of engaging as mercenaries in the service of other states; and a practice so remote from the moderation and neutrality of their original association, may be considered as chiefly derived from the foreign war, which speedily followed the domestic contest of the cantons.

The duke of Burgundy, at this time one of the most considerable princes of Europe, had conceived the project of extending his dominions from the German ocean to the Mediterranean, and establishing for himself a powerful kingdom. In the prosecution of this plan of ambition he appears to have proposed to subdue the confederate cantons, and with this view to have rejected their amicable overtures. When the hostilities, which he commenced on his frontiers, had alarmed the apprehensions of the Swiss, the crafty policy of Louis XI. of France, who was desirous of crushing his formidable neighbour, succeeded in involving them in an open war with the duke. A war was thus begun in the year 1474, which after three years ended in the ruin and death of the Burgundian, whose states were divided between France and Austria. The rich spoils, taken in this war, wrought an immediate and decisive change[45] in the character and conduct of the Swiss. War was thenceforward considered, especially by the young, as a speedy

[44] Planta, vol. i. p. 451. [45] Ibid., vol. ii. pp. 1, 42. Mallet, tome ii. p. 192.

method of acquiring wealth, and they panted only for foreign pensions, a high pay, and valuable booty. Many public efforts were employed to repress this disposition to the trade of mercenary war; but the passions of individuals had been too strongly excited, and the public counsels were necessitated to yield to their violence. How excessive the licentiousness of individuals had become, under the influence of the sudden introduction of extraordinary wealth, cannot be more fully illustrated than by the association of more than seven hundred young men[46], who assumed the name of *the mad society*, and professed to despise the control of their governors.

Four years after the conclusion of the Burgundian war Friburg and Soleure were added to the number of the cantons. Alarmed at the proofs[47], which they beheld, of the inability of the existing government to restrain the licentiousness of the people, the cantons of Berne, Zuric, and Lucerne had in the year 1478 accepted the proposal of these two cities to enter into a compact of mutual defence. The rural cantons, Schwitz, Uri, and Underwalden, were dissatisfied with this measure, as tending to give an undue preponderance to the municipal districts in the general councils; but two years afterwards they consented to receive these cities into the general confederacy, on the condition that they should be subjected to the control of the eight ancient cantons.

In the last year of the fifteenth century, or eighteen years after the incorporation of these two cantons, a violent[48], though a transitory war, broke out between the confederacy and the emperor Maximilian, which just served to give occasion to a treaty, establishing its independence. Eager in conceiving brilliant projects, but destitute of the means necessary for their accomplishment, this emperor, who had ascended the throne about six years before, was well fitted to provoke a resistance, which should decide the claims of the confederacy. When, in a contest of not quite nine months, more than twenty thousand men had perished, and almost two thousand towns, castles, and villages, had been taken and destroyed, a peace was con-

[46] Planta, vol. ii. p. 45. Mallet, tome ii. pp. 228, 229. [47] Planta, vol. ii. p. 46. [48] Ibid., pp. 57, &c.

cluded, by which the claims[49] of the Helvetic league were conceded, and its independence was virtually acknowledged.

In the first year of the sixteenth century the confederacy was again augmented by the admission of the two cities of Basle and Shaffhausen, important as bulwarks on the side of the empire; and in the year 1513, the incorporation of the country of Appenzel completed the number of the thirteen cantons, which remained unaltered even to our time. The same superiority of the eight ancient cantons having been maintained in these, as in the preceding instances, the equilibrium of the Helvetic system continued unchanged, notwithstanding the accession of new members, and the forest-cantons, the original members of the confederacy, preserved that proportion of importance in the collective concerns of the nation, which enabled them to exercise a due influence on the public deliberations.

Thus was the organisation of this interesting system perfected just three years before Zuingle began in the church of Glaris to preach the doctrines of a scriptural Christianity[50]. To develope one part of the reformation appears to have been its principal function, and it was made ready precisely for the important office.

The Helvetic part of the general reformation of religion appears however to have required some specially appropriate organ for maturing its principles, and to have found such a one in the little republic of Geneva, which neighboured the Helvetic confederacy, and formed an intimate connexion with the great protestant canton of Berne, though it did not enter into the general association of the Swiss states, but maintained its political distinctness even to the present time[51]. Though near in place, it was separated from the Helvetic cantons by the interposition

[49] The confederates maintained their immunity from the imperial chamber, and their entire exemption from all taxes or contributions imposed by the emperor; and acquired the criminal jurisdiction in the Thurgau, the civil and territorial rights in that province having long since been in their possession.—Planta, vol. ii. p. 72. [50] He however was invited to Zuric in the year 1518, and there systematically began the reformation.—Ibid., p. 130. [51] The territory of Geneva was constituted a canton of the Helvetic confederacy by the treaty of Vienna, concluded in the year 1815.

of other territories, and of the lake, to which it has communicated a name. Its population too was derived from a different source, for the Genevese were sprung from the ancient Allobroges[52], not from the Helvetii. These circumstances preserved the distinctness of this small, but important community, while the necessities of its situation drove it into such a connexion with the Helvetic states, as facilitated the transmission of the principles of the Helvetic reformation.

This little community became independent in the year 1032[53], when the second kingdom of Burgundy, in which it had been comprehended, had been terminated with the series of its princes. The government was thenceforward divided between the bishop and the count, the former having become master of the city, the latter of the adjacent territory. A government so constituted was necessarily agitated by the struggle of the two authorities, the count being always desirous of extending his dominion over the city, and of restraining the bishop to his spiritual jurisdiction. When this struggle, which commenced in the year 1120[54], had been continued during ninety-one years, the count of Savoy gained such advantages over the count of Geneva, that he was established in his place, and became from the year 1211, as the count of Geneva had previously been, the rival of the bishop.

In the progress of these contentions the people of Geneva gradually attained to importance, having found various opportunities for vindicating privileges[55], which they claimed as constituting an imperial city. At length, in the year 1444, the family of Savoy acquired possession of the bishopric of Geneva[56], which they continued generally to

[52] The country of the Allobroges extended from the Isere on the south to Geneva, and was bounded on the west by the Rhone; it comprehended that part of Dauphiné, which lies between these rivers, together with Savoy properly so named, and Geneva with its territory on the east of the lake and south of the city. The Rhone and the lake separated the Allobroges from the Helvetians.—Spon, tome i. p. 5, note. [53] Ibid., pp. 32, 33. [54] Ibid., pp. 38, 39; 49, 50, note.

[55] Spon, tome i. p. 37. [56] In the year 1401 the county of Geneva was sold to the count of Savoy, who in the year 1417 was created a duke. This duke, Amadæus VIII., in the year 1432 resigned the duchy to one son, and the county to another, becoming himself a hermit. Having acquired a reputation of sanctity by his

enjoy. The people of that city, who had at this time become considerable, were accordingly placed in opposition at once to ecclesiastical and to civil authority; and the result was that, connecting themselves first with Friburg[57], and afterwards permanently with Berne, they emancipated themselves from the double dominion, and, receiving from the latter canton the doctrine of the Helvetic reformation[58], established a constitution, in which its principles of ecclesiastical republicanism were incorporated with a republican government. Rome, the ecclesiastical metropolis of Roman Catholics, had raised itself to power amidst the contention and the weakness of the Italian governments; and Geneva found an opportunity of maintaining its independence on the common frontier of Swisserland, and Savoy.

CHAPTER IV.

Of the history of the Spanish peninsula, from the commencement of the fourteenth century to the accession of the emperor Charles V. to the crown of Spain in the year 1516.

Portuguese discoveries begun in the year 1410—Naples acquired by Aragon, 1442—Aragon united to Castile, 1479—Navarre united to both, 1490—Troubles of Granada begun, 1483—The Cape of Good Hope passed, 1484—Granada reduced and the West Indies

retreat, he was in the year 1439 elevated by the council of Basle to the papacy under the name of Felix V., and in the year 1444 he constituted himself administrator of the two bishoprics of Geneva and Lausanne. From this time the family of Savoy was generally connected with the bishopric of Geneva.—Ibid., pp. 73—84. [57] The alliance with Friburg was formed in the year 1518, and in the year 1536 Berne was associated in the league. Berne having in the year 1528 adopted the reformed religion, and having been in this particular followed by Geneva in the year 1530, Friburg renounced the alliance in the year 1534. The religion of Rome was in the year 1535 abolished at Geneva, and in the year 1557 the alliance with Berne was made perpetual. Geneva was desirous of becoming a member of the Helvetic confederacy, but this measure was obstructed by religious considerations. [58] Spon, tome i. pp. 192, &c.

discovered, 1492.—Vasques de Gama arrived in India, 1498—Brazil discovered, 1501—The king of Castile and Aragon also king of the two Sicilies, 1503—The emperor Charles V. king of Spain and the two Sicilies, 1516.

While Germany was preparing itself, as has been shown, for the great separation from the church of Rome, effected in the sixteenth century, the good order of the system appears to have required, that provision should also be made for giving to that church some new and powerful support. Even in a religious view it might have been expedient, that the new doctrines should not be permitted to spread themselves with uncontrolled rapidity, but should be subjected to the restraint of a strenuous resistance. Only a small portion of Europe could yet be prepared for embracing opinions requiring a bold independence of mind, and even among those, who were capable of receiving the doctrines of the reformation, the spirit of Christian piety would best be exercised by difficulty and suffering. In that temporal consideration, which belongs to the present inquiry, the advantage of providing a new and powerful support for the existing church, when it was to be exposed to the opposition of reformers, is yet more plainly apparent. If a political balance were to be established among the governments of Europe, it seems to have been necessary that the party of Rome should be enabled to preserve its station among them, and even to exert efforts so alarming, as should excite all the activity of their adversaries. In this manner, while the religious sentiments of the reformers were disciplined by suffering, a balance of the two great contending parties was maintained, which animated the energies of the several governments, and secured the general independence.

In the period preceding the reformation the papacy was sufficiently sustained by the government of Naples, which had been formed just when the great struggle of Gregory VII. required the support of a friendly and neighbouring power. In the more extended combinations of the sixteenth century, which involved all the governments of southern Europe, some new and more considerable aid was necessary to the stability of the Roman see. We accordingly observe a very curious process, by which this relation

of the Neapolitan government was transferred to Spain, and Spain was then connected with the imperial dignity. A few years before the middle of the fifteenth century Naples became connected with Sicily, which was governed by a branch of the reigning family of Aragon; thirty-seven years afterwards Aragon became united to Castile; twenty-four years later the king of Castile and Aragon became master also of the two Sicilies; and thirteen years afterwards, the united monarchies of Spain and the two Sicilies became connected with the imperial dignity.

The long crusade of almost eight hundred years, in which the Spaniards had been engaged with the Arabs and Moors, had particularly prepared them to be zealous for the faith of Rome. This was however more especially the character of the Castilian kingdom, by which the struggle was chiefly maintained. The other governments had their several functions, to which they were respectively adapted: Aragon that of engaging in the political interests of the Mediterranean, particularly in Sicily and Italy; Portugal that of opening the way in voyages of distant discovery, which have changed the political interests of the world; and Navarre serving chiefly to maintain a communication between two neighbouring countries, which the Pyrenees would otherwise have in a considerable degree excluded from mutual intercourse.

The kingdom of Granada, to which the possessions of the Mohammedans of Spain had been reduced in the year 1240, had in the year 1302 acquired consistency and vigour from the ability of two successive princes. From this time its power continued almost stationary nearly to the time of its reduction, which was effected in the year 1492. However important that reduction at length became to the Christian monarchy of Spain, its long postponement was also beneficial, inasmuch as it retained so long within the country the industry and refinement of the Arabs, restored in that kingdom after the expulsion of the Moorish dynasties.

The long postponement of the final overthrow of a power contracted within so narrow limits is explained partly by the state of the kingdom of Castile, partly by the continuance of the division of the remainder of the peninsula

among so many Christian governments. We observe in the history of Castile[1] a troubled minority of the sovereign commencing in the year 1312, and we have been expressly informed that a war, which had been commenced against the Mohammedans, was discontinued on account of the intestine divisions, which prevailed among the Castilians; nor from this time until the reduction of Granada do we find any interval of considerable length, and scarcely any interval whatsoever, in which the history of Castile is not filled with the struggles of its nobles, occasionally favoured by the minority, the incapacity, or the misconduct of its sovereigns. The continuance also of the division of the remainder of the peninsula has been mentioned by Mariana[2], as having postponed the ruin of the common adversary; and we accordingly perceive that Ferdinand, by whom it was at length effected, had thirteen years before united under his authority the two monarchies of Aragon and Castile.

The final reduction of the Moors of Spain, as the Mohammedans of the peninsula were indiscriminately named, was an event of great and various importance. It was most desirable for the formation of the Christian monarchy of Spain, that a people so alien from all the institutions of Christendom should not permanently hold a distinct possession within the limits of the peninsula; nor indeed could that monarchy be firmly established, so long as any other separate government should exist within it, besides Portugal, by which it was balanced in the general system of Europe. The construction too of that general system appears to have required, that this inroad of an alien population should be so far repelled, as that a state should not remain within its precincts, which must be incapable of accommodating itself to the policy of such a system, and of acting with regularity in its combinations. But these consequences of the reduction of the last kingdom of the Moors were by no means the whole of its results. It appears to have at once determined the character of the Spanish government in regard to that bigoted zeal for the church of Rome, by which it has been since so peculiarly distinguished, and in its more remote operation to have

[1] Mariana's Hist. of Spain, book xv. ch. vi. [2] Ibid., book xxv. ch. i.

caused the degradation of the Spanish monarchy, as it led to the expulsion of the industrious part of the inhabitants of the peninsula. A people so enthralled to the dominion of ecclesiastics could not indeed in any case have long preserved the energy, which is necessary for maintaining a station of political importance; but the subtraction of a multitude of industrious inhabitants[3] could not fail to precipitate a change, which would otherwise more slowly, though not less certainly, have reduced the alarming power of a bigoted and persecuting government.

Though Spain had, even in the Gothic period of its history, evinced a strong attachment to the faith of Rome, and its bishops had, in the persecution of Priscillian and his followers, exhibited the first example of a bloody intolerance, yet in general the nation was influenced[4] by a spirit of forbearance towards the Mohammedans, until the final ruin of the Moorish power had established the triumph of the church, and the depression of the barons had rendered them unable to protect their industrious vassals the Moors. In the reduction of Granada accordingly[5] conditions were granted by the conquerors, which guaranteed to the vanquished their laws, customs, and religion. These conditions were observed with tolerable fidelity during seven

[3] The Spanish historians are not agreed about the number of the Moors, who were expelled from Spain in the year 1609. Some say that they were a million, others that they were nine hundred thousand, but by most they are said to have been six hundred thousand.—Geddes's Tracts, vol. i. p. 177. Lond. 1714. In the preceding year one hundred and forty thousand had been expelled from Valentia.—Ibid., p. 158. Three millions are said to have been expelled from the time of the conquest.—De Marlès, tome iii. p. 405. The mischievous operation of these measures was speedily experienced, for in the year 1618, a memorial on the ruinous condition of the kingdom was delivered to Philip III. by a *junta*, which he had assembled for the purpose.—Geddes, vol. i. p. 178. The industry of the Moors had indeed been most ignorantly urged as a plea for expelling them, that they might not, by working more cheaply, deprive the Spaniards of the means of subsistence.—Ibid., p. 85. [4] The expulsion of the Moors had been originally proposed by pope Clement IV., who urged the king of Aragon to drive them from Valentia. The clergy and the commons favoured the measure, but it was so successfully resisted by the barons, that it was not resumed during more than three centuries.—Ibid., pp. 31—35. [5] De Marlès, tome iii. p. 375.

years; the work of persecution however was soon begun[6] with the expulsion of the Jews, in regard to whom Ferdinand was not bound by any engagement.

After seven years the inflexible spirit of Ximenes was employed in effecting[7], partly by caresses, partly by violence, an apparent conversion of the conquered people; and an insurrection of those, who were still zealous for the religion of their fathers, furnished a pretence for treating them as rebels, who had forfeited the benefits of their capitulation. When the obligation of the treaty had been thus set aside, the Moors, who remained in the country, were allowed only the alternative of death or baptism[8]. The forced conversions, which were the result, having brought them within the cognizance of the Inquisition[9], four thousand[10] were for apostacy committed to the flames, and according to one historian three thousand, according to another five thousand houses, were left without inhabitants in the districts of that horrible tribunal, multitudes having withdrawn to Barbary for safety. Still the formal and entire expulsion of the Moors was so iniquitous and impolitic, that all the bigotry of the Spanish ecclesiastics required more than a century for its accomplishment, this measure not having been effected until the year 1609.

While Castile exhibited only a long series of distraction

[6] Within three months from the conquest of Granada Ferdinand issued an edict, requiring the Jews to be baptized, or to depart from the kingdom within four months. The greater part emigrated, and the main body of these retired to Portugal, where they were afterwards forced to submit to baptism, to a number exceeding three hundred thousand persons. More than eight hundred thousand had been driven out of Spain.—Geddes, vol. i. pp. 5—8. [7] When some of the principal men of the Moors exerted their influence with their countrymen in opposition to the arts of Ximenes, he laying all humanity, saith his biographer, almost aside, caused them to be apprehended, and to be confined in dungeons, like the most atrocious malefactors.—Ibid., p. 9. [8] Several thousands of Moors however, who paid to the government ten dollars each for a passage, embarked for Barbary, the king having much need for money.—Ibid., p. 15.

[9] This tribunal had been regularly established in Castile in the year 1478.—Mariana, book xxiv. ch. vii. [10] Geddes, vol. i. pp. 16, 17. It was determined that, though it had been wrong to compel the Moors to be baptized, yet the baptisms were so valid, as to render them liable to the penalties of apostasy.—Ibid., p. 41. Summa Conc. et Pont. per Carranzam. p. 338.

and imbecility, Portugal presented a very different object. The progress of aggrandisement and improvement, which had been continued, almost without interruption, from the assumption of the royal title, in the year 1139, to the commencement of the fourteenth century, was not then terminated. Through the fourteenth century we observe, with a single exception, a succession of the wisest and ablest sovereigns; and the fifteenth was ennobled by that splendid train of maritime discovery, which appears to have been the peculiar function of this people.

The single exception, occurring among the sovereigns of Portugal in the fourteenth century, was Ferdinand, whose reign was begun in the year 1367, and ended in the year 1383. During the sixteen years of the reign of this prince[11] the nation was distracted by the troubles, which had been caused by his indiscretion and unsteadiness, and particularly by his irregular marriage with Leonora de Meneses, whom he had taken from her husband. Discontents were excited at home, and the nation was twice involved in war with the Castilians. The issue of these troubles however we discover in the succeeding reign, in the very beginning of which we find the decisive and memorable battle of Algubarota, which during nearly two centuries[12] suspended the efforts of the Castilians, for the subjugation of the neighbouring kingdom. Two wars, in which Ferdinand was wantonly engaged with that people, had been terminated by the mediation of the see of Rome, the earlier on conditions favourable to the Castilians, the later on conditions favourable to the Portuguese. The two nations were thus excited one against the other during the imprudent reign of this prince; and a claim[13] of the succession to the crown of Portugal at his death having tempted the king of Castile to renew hostilities, when a prince of ability was in possession of the throne, a decisive

[11] Hist. de Portugal par De la Clede, tome i. pp. 302—330.

[12] The battle of Algubarota was fought in the year 1385, and the conquest of Portugal was effected by Philip II. of Spain in the year 1580.

[13] Ferdinand having died without male issue, the king of Castile claimed the succession as having married his daughter, but the people of Portugal, averse from the dominion of the Castilians, set aside his pretension, and raised a new family to the throne.—De la Clede, tome i. pp. 331—359.

engagement established the distinctness of the two governments, which, as they advanced towards maturity, must otherwise have been afterwards engaged in a more violent struggle, and at a more inconvenient time.

A similar interruption, but of shorter continuance, has been remarked[14] in the earlier period of the history of Portugal; and it has been shown to have been the crisis of the establishment of the papal ascendency over the government of the country. This determined its relation to the see of Rome, the later its independence of the crown of Spain. The greatness of Portugal appears accordingly to have advanced in a career, restrained only by such interruptions, as were required for ascertaining its situation in these important particulars.

The union of Aragon with Castile was effected in the year 1479, in consequence of the marriage[15] of Ferdinand, the *infant* or prince of the former and king of Sicily, with Isabella sister of the king of the latter. Thirty-seven years before that event the kingdom of Naples had been wrested from the family of Anjou, and, in addition to that[16] of Sicily, had been acquired by the reigning family of Aragon. When this connexion had been effected with southern Italy, the function of Aragon appears to have been discharged, and its distinctness from Castile to have had no longer an object. The union of the two Spanish crowns was then, on the contrary, the natural process, by which the connexion formed with the two Sicilies was extended to Castile.

It has been already remarked that the long postponement of the extinction of the Moorish power was benefi-

[14] Book i. ch. xiv. [15] This allance was at the same time sought by Alphonso king of Portugal. Isabella preferred the prince of Aragon, perhaps to thwart the marquess de Villena, the king's favourite, who feared the character of Ferdinand.—De Marlès, tome iii. p. 316. If Isabella had made the contrary choice, the whole system of Europe might have been embarrassed. Isabella succeeded to the crown of Castile in the year 1474, and Ferdinand to that of Aragon in the year 1479, having been in the year 1475 crowned king of Castile. [16] The two kingdoms of Naples and Sicily were however again separated after a union of thirteen years, but both were governed by branches of the Aragonian family. A re-union was effected by Ferdinand, king of Aragon and Sicily in the year 1503.

cial to Spain, inasmuch as it retained within the country the industry and refinement which had been revived in the little kingdom of Granada. The influence of the protracted weakness of Castile which was the cause of that postponement, may now be indicated, as it affected the independence of the two lesser governments of Aragon and Portugal. If the Castilians had advanced to greatness with little interruption, they must have so overborne these less considerable kingdoms, as to have suppressed the operations, which have been represented as their respective functions; Aragon could not have formed its connexion with Sicily and Naples, nor would Portugal have been enabled and disposed to effect her great achievements of discovery and conquest. As these events actually occurred, we find all so arranged, as to preclude any embarrassing interference. The kingdom of Naples had been acquired by the Aragonian family of Sicily thirty-seven years before Aragon became connected with Castile, and the Cape of Good Hope had been passed by the Portuguese eight years before the conquest of Granada established the power of the central monarchy of Spain.

The kingdom of Granada was at length predisposed in a very remarkable manner to receive its termination from Castile. The prosperity of this kingdom had been checked from time to time by various seditions, in which the Castilians occasionally interfered; but in the year 1482[17], or ten years before its subjugation, the son of the king revolted against him, and in the following year the brother of the king was set up by a third party, as the only person capable of delivering the state. While the state was thus destroying itself, Ferdinand had only to maintain the public distractions, by supporting the young prince, who was the weakest of the three chiefs. The brother of the king solicited aid from the sovereigns of Africa, in vain, either because the Moors of Africa[18] were engaged in other wars, or because the Christians commanded the communication between the two countries. In such circumstances the ruin of the kingdom was inevitable, and it was accordingly reduced to submission in the beginning of the year 1492.

[17] De Marlès, tome iii. pp. 326—380. [18] Mariana, bk. xxv. ch. iii.

Ferdinand by this conquest became sovereign of the whole of the peninsula except Portugal and Navarre. Portugal long retained its distinctness, and again recovered it after an interval of sixty years; but Navarre was speedily absorbed into the new monarchy of Spain. The little kingdom of Navarre, which, by the marriage of its queen, had in the year 1284[19] passed into the royal family of France, was separated after forty-three years from the royal family, though still governed by sovereigns of the same nation. From this year the tranquillity of Navarre was much disturbed, and from the year 1425 its history was a series of perpetual agitation. The little state[20] being divided by factions, headed by two powerful families, the kings maintained their authority only by an unremitting vigilance in preserving the balance of the two parties. In the year 1490 John III. abandoned the wise conduct of his predecessors, and, attaching himself to one of the two parties, drove the other into a connexion with Ferdinand, who eagerly availed himself of this opportunity of further aggrandisement.

Whether we regard Navarre as forming with Aragon and Castile a little system of political interests, in which it served to maintain an equilibrium, or as a medium of national communication between the neighbouring countries of France and Spain, which would otherwise have been precluded from intercourse by the Pyrenean mountains, in either view the utility of its separate existence must have at this time ceased. When Aragon and Castile had been united under a common sovereign, it was no longer required for balancing their opposing interests; and when the time was approaching, in which Spain, connected with Austria, was to be involved in a long series of hostility against France, it ceased to be expedient that the latter country should be politically connected with a territory included within the limits of the former.

The connexion of Spain with the house of Austria and the empire was effected by a combination of various occurrences[21]. Philip, archduke of Austria and son of the

[19] Abrégé Chron. de l'Hist. d'Espagne et de Portugal, tome i. pp. 410, 460. [20] Revol. d'Espagne, tome iii. pp. 472, 473.
[21] Robertson's Charles V., vol. ii. p. 1—3.

emperor Maximilian, married Joanna the daughter of Ferdinand and Isabella, king and queen of Castile and Aragon. Isabella, in whose right alone Ferdinand had become king of Castile, died in the year 1504, having appointed Ferdinand to be regent of that kingdom, until her grandson Charles, the son of Philip, should have attained to full age. Philip, in a visit to Spain, had offended Isabella, who on this account bequeathed the regency to her husband, Joanna having been necessarily excluded on account of her entire incapacity of mind. The pride of the Castilians however revolted against the sole government of a king of Aragon, especially as the character of Ferdinand was severe and unamiable. Two years therefore after the death of Isabella, Ferdinand was set aside, and Joanna and Philip were declared queen and king of Castile. The reign of Philip having been terminated with his life by a fever within three months after his elevation, it became unavoidable that the regency should be again committed to the king of Aragon. That prince then by his prudent administration reconciled the Castilians to his government. His death, which happened in the year 1516, conveyed to Charles, afterwards emperor, who was at that time aged sixteen, the united crowns of Castile, Aragon, and Navarre, together with the crown of the two Sicilies.

In these events a singular combination of circumstances favourable to the succession of Charles V. is plainly discoverable, and it must be acknowledged that some such combination was required for transferring the sovereignty of Spain to a family of German princes. The incurable incapacity of Joanna just fitted her for transmitting the crown through the medium of a regency. The original appointment of Ferdinand, while it offended the Castilians, disposed them to admit more cheerfully the pretensions of the archduke Philip. The death of Philip left an opportunity to Ferdinand for exercising vigour and activity in regulating and extending the monarchy of Spain. The death of Ferdinand, happening as soon as his grandson Charles could be considered competent to assume the government, removed the impediment, which might have been presented by his possession of the sovereign power,

as his wise nomination of the celebrated Ximenes to the regency, during the absence of his grandson, provided the means of overcoming the remaining jealousy of the people.

While the other governments of the peninsula were thus engaged, Portugal began and prosecuted, her splendid series of discovery and conquest in the distant regions of the earth, and even led the Spanish monarchy to emulate her enterprising spirit. New worlds were accordingly thrown open to the energies of Europe, just as the system of its political relations was to be adjusted; and, while new resources were furnished to its states, the general excitement of industry gave importance to the lower orders in every community, and introduced into its monarchies some additional feeling of independence.

It is remarkable that not only Africa is said to have been circumnavigated by the ancients, but even some progress had been made in a later age by the voyagers of the north in the discovery of the existence of a western continent[22], so that both the memorable enterprises of this period had been anticipated. The accounts, which have been given of two ancient circumnavigations of Africa, have indeed been very generally questioned; but the great geographer of our time has declared his persuasion of their truth[23], and has even pointed out the local influences of winds and currents, which facilitated the attempt, as originally made from the eastern side of that continent. This circumnavigation is said to have been effected by Necho king of Egypt, about six hundred years before the Christian era. The other, which he believes to have been

[22] A country, which was probably the coast of Labrador or Newfoundland, was discovered by an Icelander named Biarn in the year 1001, and called Vinland on account of some vines, which are said to have grown there. From the year 1121 this country appears to have been forgotten in the north; and that part of Greenland, which had embraced Christianity, having been lost, Iceland also having declined from its former condition, and the northern nations being wasted by a pestilence, and weakened by internal dissensions, all remembrance of it was at length utterly obliterated, and the Norwegian Vinlanders, having no longer any connexion with Europe, were either incorporated with their barbarian neighbours, or overpowered by them and destroyed.—Introd. à l'Hist. de Dannemarc par Mallet, ch. xi. [23] Rennell's Geography of Herodotus, pp. 676, &c. Lond. 1800.

effected not long afterwards, is said to have been conducted by Hanno a Carthaginian, and to have been begun from the west;[24] but it has lately been pronounced to have been limited to the mouth of the Gambia. All other knowledge of these expeditions having been lost, the accounts were regarded by subsequent writers as fictitious. The Portuguese however were not destitute of information[25], fitted to encourage an adventurous mind to attempt again this great experiment of maritime enterprise. Independently of other information concerning the form and extent of Africa, which might have been current among the Arabs, and therefore might have been communicated to the Christians of the Spanish peninsula, the *great* or *ambient sea* is particularly described by Abulfeda, who died in the year 1331. It has accordingly been related of prince Henry, the illustrious patron of Portuguese discovery, that he returned from the siege of Ceuta in Africa impressed with a strong disposition to attempt the discovery of unknown countries.

To the accomplishment of this important and arduous undertaking Portugal appears to have been most appropriately adapted. Mountainous yet fertile, it was fitted to nourish a bold and crowded population[26]: stretching along the western ocean, it was fitted to dispose its inhabitants to encounter the hazards of extended navigation: adjacent to the Atlantic shore of the African continent, it tempted them to proceed in their coasting voyages from one promontory to another, until they should reach its long-sought extremity: and wrested by a crusade from the dominion of the Moors, it was inhabited by a people filled with an unconquerable zeal for propagating their religion among unbelieving nations. Even the limitation of Portugal, on its northern side, appears to have contributed a share of influence, as it seems to have precluded the country from

[24] Hist. Researches into the Politics, Intercourse, and Trade of the Carthaginians, Ethiopians and Egyptians, by A. H. L. Heeren, vol. i. app. v. Oxf. 1832. Another expedition was at the same time sent to the western coast of Europe, of which some account has been preserved in the Ora Maritima of Festus Avienus, composed for the instruction of his relative Probus.—Ibid. app. vi. [25] Rennell's Geography of Herodotus, pp. 687, 688. [26] Portugal was called the *marrow* of Spain.—Resandii Antiq. Lusit. l. iii.; quoted by Mickle, Transl. of the Lusiad, vol. i. p. 37. Dubl. 1791.

European connexion, and thus to have devoted it to the navigation of the ocean[27]. The princes too of this country formed an extraordinary succession of able sovereigns, interrupted only by exceptions instrumental in adjusting the external relations of the government. The character of prince Henry, the great patron of discovery, is also deserving of particular attention, for the difficulties, which he encountered, afford a decisive proof, that the judicious and indefatigable patronage of such a prince could alone surmount the impediments opposed to it by the apprehensions of his countrymen[28].

The Portuguese voyages of discovery were begun so early, as in the year 1410[29], when prince Henry fitted out two ships, which proceeded sixty leagues beyond Cape Nam, significantly thus denominated from the Portuguese negative, as the supposed limit of naval adventure. In the year 1420 the same prince sent out three ships, two of

[27] In the later relations of Portugal the interposition of Spanish provinces has served in particular to detach the country more effectually from its original connexion with France, and to leave it open for forming one with England. [28] The endeavours, which had been made for about eighty years, to discover the East Indies by the southern ocean, had been the favourite topic of complaint, and never was any measure more unpopular than the expedition of Gama. Emmanuel's council were almost unanimous against the attempt. Some dreaded the introduction of wealth, and its attendants luxury and effeminacy; others affirmed that no adequate advantages could arise from so perilous and remote a navigation; others were alarmed, lest the Egyptian sultan should be displeased; and others foresaw, that its success would combine all the princes of Christendom in a league for the destruction of Portugal. If glory, interest, or the propagation of the gospel were desired, Africa and Ethiopia, they said, afforded both nearer and more advantageous fields. The thousands, who crowded the shore, when Gama gave his sails to the wind, have been described by Osorio, as uttering the lamentations of a funeral.—De Rebus Emmanuelis, lib. i. p. 17. Coloniæ, 1586.

[29] De la Clede, liv. xi. xiii.

> ———the genius then
> Of navigation, that in hopeless sloth
> Had slumbered on the vast Atlantic deep
> For idle ages, starting, heard at last
> The Lusitanian prince, who, heaven-inspired,
> To love of useful glory roused mankind,
> And in unbounded commerce mixed the world.
>
> Thomson's Summer, 1006, &c.

which for the first time ventured into the ocean, where they discovered Madeira and some other islands. The progress of discovery was however so slow, that Henry did not live to see its accomplishment. From the year 1420, fifty years elapsed before any vessel doubled the cape of Sierra Leone; nor was it until the year 1484, that Bartholomew Diaz sailed round the southern cape of Africa, which he named the Cape of Storms, but his sovereign more appropriately the Cape of Good Hope. Thirteen years still elapsed, before the concluding effort was exerted, Vasques de Gama not having been sent out until the year 1497. The foundation of the oriental empire of Portugal was laid by Alfonso Albuquerque[30], who was sent out in the year 1508, and held the government of India little more than five years.

The commerce of the east has been in every age the grand source of commercial prosperity. The natural productions of the eastern countries afford gratifications, which have been uniformly prized by the luxurious; and such are the ingenuity, the industry, and the moderation of their inhabitants, that their manufactures, both by their elegance and by their cheapness[31], have commanded the most eager competition. It has been estimated by doctor Robertson[32], that the Portuguese, when they had discovered the naval communication with India, might supply the other nations of Europe with these commodities at a rate less than one half of that, at which they had been sold by the Venetians. The historian of the league of Cambrai

[30] He established two capitals of this Indian empire, Goa and Malacca, having extended his settlements from Ormuz in Persia to the Chinese sea. Of the wisdom and justice, with which he formed this empire, the noblest attestation was borne in the affection, with which his memory was cherished among the natives. The princes of India clothed themselves in mourning on his death, and it became customary for the Mohammedan and Gentoo inhabitants of Goa, when wronged by his countrymen, to weep at his tomb, utter their complaints to his *manes*, and call upon his God to avenge their injuries.—Mickle's Transl. of the Lusiad, vol. i. pp. 126—130. The Indian empire of Portugal was completed by John de Castro, the fourth viceroy. — Ibid., vol. ii. p. 452, note. He first brought the orange tree to Europe.—Ibid., vol. i. p. 170. [31] The application of steam to manufacture has latterly destroyed this advantage, muslins being now exported to India. [32] Hist. Disquis. concerning India, pp. 201, 202.

says, that they sold them at one-fourth of the customary price[33]. This sudden and considerable diminution of price, while it at once deprived the Venetians of that traffic, by which especially their republic had been aggrandised, gave occasion to a very considerable augmentation of the demand for eastern goods in every part of Europe, and consequently increased very much the activity of that domestic industry, by which the means of purchasing these luxuries were to be provided.

The Venetians could not suffer the very stamina of their wealth and power to be thus destroyed, without exerting some effort to maintain them. They accordingly leagued themselves with the sultan of Egypt, supplying him with timber and ammunition for vessels to be despatched from the Red Sea. The league of Cambrai however, by which in the year 1508 the kings of France and Spain, the pope, and the emperor, were all confederated against the republic, paralysed just at this time the power of Venice, and thus critically disabled it for exerting such efforts to preserve its eastern commerce, as might too much have interfered with the establishment of the Portuguese dominion in India. This is a very remarkable instance of the co-operation of remote and unconnected causes. The combination of political agencies, which was employed in extending through Europe the relations of a federative policy, arranged among the Italian states by Lorenzo de' Medici, served also to facilitate the great revolution of modern commerce, by which it was spread over the ocean. Nor were these results distinct and independent, for from the extension of commerce sprang the greatness of the British empire, by which the federative system of Europe was ultimately maintained.

In estimating the importance of the Portuguese discovery, our consideration should however by no means be limited to the extension of the commerce of Europe[34], for it may easily be shown to have had a very direct connexion with the safety of the growing system of European policy. The Ottoman power had in the year 1453 been established within the limits of Europe by the capture of Constantinople, and was then prepared to give to the resources of the

[33] Hist. de la Ligue faite à Cambray, &c., tome ii. p. 265. Haye, 1710. [34] Mickle's Transl. of the Lusiad, vol. i. p. 175.

Mohammedan nations all the energy of a new sovereignty. the eastern dominion of the Arabs having given to them the commerce of India, the discoveries and establishments of the Portuguese wrested from the Mohammedans the important traffic of the east, at the very time when the recent triumph, gained over the Greek empire by the Turks, had rendered them most formidable antagonists to the rest of Europe. The Turkish power, deprived of the trade of India, might serve to compress into a closer connexion the political system of Christendom, and to repel its commercial activity from the ancient channels into the more extensive ranges of modern traffic; but, if possessed of that trade, it would have been too powerful for the Christian states, and would have destroyed instead of merely compressing. The Portuguese may accordingly be considered as having completed the crusades[35], and, as the historian of the Roman empire has admitted[36], that the first of these expeditions might have been justified by a consideration of the danger of the Greek empire, so did their completion preserve, in the very crisis of its formation, the federative system of Christendom. The Portuguese were indeed actuated by a correspondent principle of religious hostility, the propagation of their faith having been a grand and prevailing motive in all these enterprises[37].

[35] Mickle's Transl. of the Lusiad, vol. ii. p. 444. [36] Decline and Fall, &c., vol. vi. p. 10. [37] About six years after Gama's discovery of India, the sultan of Egypt sent Maurus, the abbot of the monks of Jerusalem, who inhabited Mount Sion, on an embassy to pope Julius II. The sultan, threatening to treat the Christians of the east with great severity in case of refusal, entreated the pope to desire Emmauel king of Portugal to send no more fleets to the Indian seas. The pope sent Maurus to Emmanuel, who in reply assured him, that no threats, no dangers, could make him alter his resolutions, lamenting that it had not yet been in his power to fulfil his promise of demolishing the sepulchre, and of erasing from the earth every memorial of Mohammed. This, he added, was the first purpose of sending his fleets to India.—Osorio, p. 111. But, whatever they professed, or even felt in Europe, the Portuguese were in the east too much occupied in acquiring territory and riches, to give much attention to religious concerns, and at length they proved themselves to be more anxious to reduce the ancient Christians of that country into subjection to the see of Rome, than to proselyte the infidels.—Hist. of the Church of Malabar by Geddes, p. 4. Lond. 1694. In the year 1599 a synod was assembled at Diamper, in which the spiritual conquest of these Chris-

The reduction of the Mohammedan dominion in India was a work, which required a people, whom, though bordering the ocean, their local circumstances had rendered much more military than commercial. India was not an unimproved and thinly inhabited country, inviting the resort of adventurers, and offering to them the possession of its vacant regions. Establishments could there be formed only by efforts of military prowess, the country being already occupied by powerful kingdoms, for which the common interest of the Mohammedan nations procured during almost a century the most strenuous assistance from Egypt and Constantinople. The irruption of Tamerlane, towards the end of the fourteenth century, appears to have weakened the establishments of the Mohammedans in India, and thus to have prepared them for the subsequent successes of the Portuguese. Much however remained to be accomplished, and Portugal sent into the east a succession of heroes. When indeed the military heroism of this nation had erected an Indian empire on the ruin of the Mohammedan power it might be safely transferred to a commercial people. The Dutch accordingly possessed themselves of the important stations of the eastern trade during the temporary suspension of the independence of Portugal, when that kingdom had been by Philip II. of Spain united with his hereditary crown,

tians was effected. But from this very time is dated the decline of the Portuguese power in India, and it has been, in part at least, ascribed to the ambitious policy manifested in this transaction.—Ibid., p. 412, note. The Christians found by the Portuguese in India had during thirteen centuries been governed by a succession of bishops, sent to them by the patriarch of Antioch. The churches on the sea-coast were at this time compelled to acknowledge the supremacy of the pope, and adopt the doctrines of Rome; but those of the interior country, rejecting the claim of ecclesiastical dominion, sought refuge in the mountains under the protection of the native princes. These protestants of the east, as they have been justly denominated by doctor Buchanan, lay concealed in their retreats, and were scarcely known to exist, when they were discovered by the enterprising zeal of this inquirer. He has reported, that the doctrines of those Syrian Christians at this day are pure, and agree in all essential articles with the church of England; and that in particular they hold the same doctrines of atonement and sanctification, and their creed accords with the Athanasian, except in not containing the damnatory clauses.—Buchanan's Christian Researches in Asia, pp. 109, 123, 124. Lond. 1811.

this commercial revolution explaining the bearing of that political combination.

The discovery of a maratime communication with the east would have produced its effects very imperfectly, if Columbus[38] had not at the same time discovered the existence of a western region, which was to furnish a more abundant supply of the precious metals, as the discovery of the mines of the Hartz had before made provision for the limited commerce of Germany. As the people of India required little except the productions furnished by their own industry, the trade of that country had been managed chiefly by the exportation of those metals, and for extending it a new and copious supply of them was indispensably required. This was accordingly the first result of the efforts of Columbus, though his object had been to arrive at the east by a shorter and easier voyage than the circumnavigation of Africa, which the Portuguese were at this time prosecuting. If he had succeeded in his expectation of reaching India, the two nations would probably have met in the east, and have contended for the prize, until both had been exhausted in the struggle. Disappointed as he was by the discovery of an intervening continent, they peaceably co-operated to the extension of the commerce of Europe.

This other great enterprise had been most seasonably facilitated by the invention of the astrolabe[39], which had grown

[38] He was probably born in Genoa, where his father was long resident. His name was Colombo, latinized by himself into Columbus in his earlier letters, agreeably to the custom of the time. When he went to Spain he changed his name to Colon, the reason of which, assigned by his son, was that his descendants might be distinguished from collateral branches of his family. Colonus, supposed to be the Roman original of the name, he abbreviated to Colon, to adapt it to the language of Castile. Much of his earlier life is supposed to have been passed in voyaging in the Mediterranean. He arrived at Lisbon about the year 1470, and there acquired a knowledge of the enterprises made under the direction of prince Henry. He left Portugal in the year 1484, and went to Spain in the year 1486.—Irving's Hist. of the Life and Voyages of Columbus, vol. i. pp. 5—8, 15, 22, 40, 89, 90, 101, 187. Lond. 1828. [39] Ibid., p. 76. This instrument has since been improved and modified into the modern quadrant, of which, even at its first introduction, it possessed all the essential advantages. The application of the astrolabe to navigation, Mr. Irving adds, was one of those timely events, which seem to have something providential in them. It was immediately after this event, that Columbus proposed his voyage of discovery to the crown of Portugal.—Ibid., p. 78.

out of the anxious desire of John II. king of Portugal to prosecute with more celerity and effect the circumnavigation of Africa. Calling on the learned of his kingdom, he required them to consider how science might be applied to the improvement of the skill of his mariners, and an instrument was devised, by which the seaman, observing with it the altitude of the sun, could ascertain his distance from the equator. The mariner's compass had before facilitated the navigation of the Mediterranean; the astrolabe at this time opened the navigation of the ocean.

Even with this assistance however Columbus might have shrunk from his enterprise, if two considerable errors[40] had not powerfully impressed his imagination. One of these was a persuasion, that the most eastern part of Asia known to the ancients could not be separated from the Azores by more than a third part of the circumference of the globe; the other, that Asia extended much further to the east, so as to diminish much the intervening distance. An error similar to these may be supposed to have encouraged the circumnavigation of Africa, it being believed[41] that that continent was terminated near the equinoctial line.

The first discovery[42] of Columbus, that of San Salvador, or Cat Island, one of the Bahama islands, was effected in the year 1492, and therefore in the interval between the discovery of the Cape of Good Hope, accomplished by Bartholomew de Diaz in the year 1486, and the voyage of Vasquez de Gama to India in the year 1498. But, though Columbus[43] afterwards discovered the main-land of Ame-

[40] Among the authorities, which had assisted in leading him into these errors, his son has from his papers cited the opinion of Aristotle, Seneca, and Pliny, that one might pass from Cadiz to India in a few days; and also of Strabo, who observed that the ocean surrounds the earth, bathing on the east the shores of India, on the west those of Spain and Mauritania, so that it is easy to navigate from one to another on the same parallel.—Irving's Hist. of the Life and Voyages of Columbus, vol. i. p. 55. [41] Mickle's Transl. of the Lusiad, vol. i. p. 48, note. [42] In this voyage he also discovered Cuba, and St. Domingo, or Haiti.—Ibid., pp. 237, 249, 267, 303. In this voyage too the variation of the compass was for the first time noticed.—Ibid., p. 201. [43] In the year 1498, in his third voyage, he discovered the main land of South America, adjacent to the Gulf of Paria. In the year 1502, in his fourth, he discovered the coast of Honduras.—Ibid., vol. ii. p. 383; vol. iii. p. 204.

rica, he was not the first European who reached the western continent. Sebastian Cabot, or Gabotta, a Venetian resident in England, excited by the general admiration of the success of Columbus, who was believed to have accomplished the much-desired passage to India, undertook to arrive at the same country by a shorter course, steering towards the north-west, and in the year 1497[44] ranged along the coast of North America, a year before Columbus entered the Gulf of Paria. The preparation for a war with Scotland withdrew the attention of the English from such enterprises, and abandoned them to the Spaniards and Portuguese. From both Cabot however and Columbus has been taken the honour of bestowing a name upon the newly-discovered continent. Amerigo Vespucci, a Florentine, who in the year 1499 engaged in a private adventure of discovery, published on his return an account of his voyage, which attracted so much attention, that his name was after some time given to the country, which he untruly pretended to have first visited in a previous voyage, performed in the year 1497[45]. In the last year of the fifteenth century, Pedro Alvarez Cabral, sailing to India, accidentally discovered Brazil[46] for the Portuguese, the only important possession, which continued to our time to belong to that people. The grand series of naval enterprises of this period was completed by the voyage of Magalhaens[47], who in the year 1520 passed into the Pacific Ocean by the strait since designated by his name, and one of whose five ships, after he had been killed in one of the islands of that sea, accomplished the first circumnavigation of the globe[48].

That the discovery of Columbus should have belonged to the Spanish government, though previously offered to Por-

[44] Hackluyt's Voyages, vol. iii. pp. 6, 7. Lond. 1600. [45] In a letter, written by him in the year 1504, he represented himself as having performed four voyages to the New World, in the first of which, alleged to have been performed in the year 1497, he claimed to have discovered Paria. The question has been minutely considered by Mr. Irving, who has come to the conclusion, that he did not perform such a voyage.—Hist. of the Life and Voyages of Columbus, vol. iv. pp. 172, &c. [46] Robertson's Hist. of America, vol. i. p. 213. London, 1803.

[47] De la Clede, tome i. p. 627. [48] This voyage was begun on the 10th day of August, in the year 1519, and completed on the 8th day of September in the year 1522, so that it occupied three years and twenty-nine days.—Ibid.

tugal, was primarily the result of the treachery[49], with which an attempt was made to defraud him of his enterprise, by sending out a ship with the instructions, which he had furnished. Genoa, to which he is said to have then repeated a proposition formerly made, was at that time incapable of the effort[50]. He finally placed his reliance on the governments of England and Spain, and, while he despatched his brother Bartholomew to the court of Henry VII., the English sovereign, he himself resorted to Ferdinand and Isabella, with whom he succeeded after a tedious solicitation of six years. In this interval the application of his brother had been approved by Henry VII.; but the consent of this monarch came too late[51], for Columbus had already prevailed with the Spanish sovereigns[52]. Magalhaens appears to have been a native of Portugal[53], and to have been driven into the service of Spain, by the refusal of Emmanuel king

[49] Irving, vol. i. pp. 87, &c. [50] Genoa had begun to decay in the year 1381, from which time her history is a series of discord and humiliation. [51] Bartholomew, who had been despatched in the year 1485, was taken in his passage by pirates, who chained him to the oar. He at length effected his escape, and in the year 1489 arrived in England, where for some time he found it necessary to seek a subsistence by making maps and charts. When at last he was able to procure an audience of the king, the scheme was approved, and he was sent to bring Columbus to England; but, before he arrived in Spain, his brother had sailed on his second voyage. — Henry's Hist. of Britain, vol. xii. p. 311. [52] The conditions of the agreement were: 1. That Columbus should have for himself, his heirs and successors, the office of admiral in all the lands, which he might discover, with honours and prerogatives similar to those enjoyed by the high admiral of Castile. 2. That he should be viceroy over all the said lands, with the privilege of nominating for the government of each island or province three candidates, one of whom should be elected by the sovereigns. 3. That he should be entitled to reserve to himself one-tenth of the profit on all merchandise within his admiralty. 4. That he, or his lieutenant should be sole judge in all causes arising out of traffic between those countries and Spain, provided that the high admiral of Castile had similar jurisdiction in his district. 5. That he might then, and at all subsequent times, contribute an eighth part of the expense of fitting out vessels to sail on this enterprise, and receive an eighth part of the profits.— Irving's Hist. of the Life and Voyages of Columbus, vol. i. pp. 169, 170. He returned to Spain for the last time in the year 1504; but in the same year died Isabella, and with her died his hope of realising the conditions, which should secure honour and advantage to himself and his posterity. He himself died in the year 1506.—Ibid., vol. iv. pp. 1—45. [53] De la Clede, tome i. p. 626.

of that country to augment, by so small an addition as that of half a ducat each month, a pension which he enjoyed as the reward of distinguished services performed in India. So trivial was the motive, which prompted this navigator to avenge himself, by leading the rivals of his country through another course to the Moluccas, which he maintained to belong to them in the distribution of the newly discovered countries of the globe[54].

CHAPTER V.

Of the history of France, from the first meeting of the states general in the year 1303 *to the accession of Francis I. in the year* 1515.

War with England begun in the year 1339—*Jacquerie*, and ruin of the states-general, 1358—Treaty of Bretigni concluded, 1360—Aggrandisement of the parliament—War renewed with England, 1369—Treaty of Troyes concluded, 1420—Henry VI. of England king of France, 1422—Maid of Orleans, 1429—War with England ended, 1457—Territories of the duke of Burgundy, except the duchy, transferred to Austria, 1477—Italian expedition of Charles VIII., 1494—Italian expedition of Louis XII., 1499.

THE history of the government of France has been traced to the first meeting of the states general in the year 1303, when the feudal form of government, which had been established in the tenth century, may be considered as having ceased to be the ostensible constitution of the state. The habits of that system did indeed long subsist in France, and many of its distinctions were abolished only by the recent revolution; but the public government of the nation ceased to be feudal, when its concerns began to be debated in a

[54] The Roman pontiff, on the application of Ferdinand of Spain, in the year 1493, ordained that the division should be made by an imaginary line, conceived to be drawn from pole to pole a hundred leagues westward from the Azores and Cape de Verde isles; but, the king of Portugal objecting to that division, it was in the same year agreed between the two kings, that the line should be removed two hundred and seventy leagues further towards the west.—Anderson's Hist. of Commerce, vol. i. p. 316.

convention of representatives of the different orders of the state. The present chapter will comprehend the period of time, within which was comprised the whole series of these national assemblies, ending in that species of moderated despotism, to which Montesquieu has appropriated the name of monarchy, as distinguished from a simple despotism on the one part, and on the other from a limited and balanced royalty.

The review of the interior history of the French government is particularly interesting, as it presents a very remarkable contrast to the progressive formation of our valued constitution. In the history of the British constitution we perceive a continual advancement towards the attainment of public liberty, from the humble beginning of popular representation in the reign of Henry III., to the completion of a mixed and balanced government at the revolution, which placed William III. upon the throne. In that of the French government we observe the representatives of cities introduced at once with full and equal powers into the assemblies of the nation; but we see these assemblies disappointing the hopes of the people, and after two centuries of interrupted and precarious existence sinking into disuse, and giving place to the vague pretensions of a judicial body, the parliament of the capital. By investigating the causes of such a difference in the results of these two great processes of political interests, a distinct conception of the peculiar nature of the British government may best be acquired.

France, under the third race of kings[1], was, until the reign of Louis IX., which was begun in the year 1226, wholly destitute of a legislative power, the regulations made by the predecessors of this prince being treaties concluded between the king and individual nobles, not general determinations binding through the whole extent of the community. The appeals however, which were latterly introduced, contributed much to cause the king to be considered as the guardian of the customs of the kingdom, and from this character to the assumption of a legislative authority the transition was natural and easy. The personal qualities of Louis IX. favoured this important modification of the government. While the confidence inspired by his virtues

[1] Mably, liv. iv. ch. ii.

disposed the people to acquiesce in his ordinances, he was careful to begin with proscribing only those abuses, of which they generally complained, and to manage their prejudices with attention and prudence. The nobles were conciliated by relinquishing to them the fines levied for offences committed within their lands. The clergy, jealous of the power of the nobles, by which their own had been repressed, were of themselves sufficiently eager to aggrandise the royal authority. But nothing contributed so much to invest the king with a legislative character, as the introduction of the new jurisprudence, which was substituted for the barbarous trial by combat. In the reign of Philip III., which followed that of Louis IX., it was found necessary to introduce into the parliament persons of inferior rank, who were competent to conduct the formalities of judicial proceedings. These soon became the principals in that jurisdiction, of which they had been at first but the humble assistants; and the nobles, disgusted with an attendance on the courts, for which they were so little qualified, not only withdrew their own presence, but abandoned to the king the appointment of the persons, by whom they were succeeded. The king accordingly, at the commencement of each parliament, nominated its members, and these were naturally disposed to enlarge the authority of the crown, on which they depended, in opposition to the nobles, by whom they were despised.

In consequence of the change thus begun by Louis IX., Philip IV., who began his reign in the year 1285, was the sole legislator of his kingdom; but the nation was still animated by a haughty spirit of independence, which admonished him to exercise the prerogative with a cautious circumspection. In this situation the contest, in which his pecuniary embarrassment had involved him with the Roman pontiff, determined him to convene a general assembly composed of all the orders of the nation, which expedient he afterwards turned to the purpose of relieving himself from his pecuniary difficulties. As the nobles[2] were limited by customs or charters in regard to the contributions, which they exacted from their vassals, they had given little opposition to the attempts of the sovereign to levy contributions

[2] Mably, liv. v. ch. i.

for himself also within their lands[3], and were perhaps not dissatisfied with seeing the inhabitants of the towns punished in this manner for the independence, to which they aspired. But the uncertainty and want of correspondence in these operations, which he was forced to conduct by insinuation, rather than by authority, rendered it desirable that an assembly should be convened, the resolutions of which might experience a prompt and general acquiescence.

It might at the first view be supposed, that the government would thenceforward become in a considerable degree aristocratical, or even popular. The nation however, on the contrary, appeared to have assembled only for the purpose of acknowledging in a more authentic manner the new prerogative of the sovereign, and establishing his authority. The circumstances of the nation and the crafty policy of Philip will furnish the explanation of the conduct of these conventions of the states. The feudal government of France had not been fitted to inspire the sentiment of a common interest, and to dispose the nation to act according to a concerted plan in vindication of its rights. Formed amidst the anarchy of a declining dynasty, it cantoned the kingdom into lordships, in each of which a chief exercised an almost independent power, little connected with the other barons, often engaged in hostility with them, and alienating by his exactions and violences the other orders of the state. The cities on the other hand were adverse to the pretensions of the clergy, equally as of the nobles, and therefore not at all disposed to unite their interests with those of either of these classes. Each of the three orders accordingly, when they met in one common assembly, endeavoured to effect its own purposes, not by entering into a prudent compromise with others, but by conciliating the favour of the sovereign. The public spirit, of which the French people was then thus destitute, might perhaps have been gradually formed, if Philip had not managed with dexterity the several assemblies, which he had occasion to convene. He did not continue to hold meetings of the states general at certain intervals of time, and in certain places, which would have given

[3] Philip II. had demanded extraordinary aids from the towns under the pretence of the crusades, and Louis IX. had exacted them for the relief of his own particular necessities.

order and consistency to their proceedings. Those which he held, were sometimes provincial, sometimes confined to one or more bailiwicks; on some occasions he convened the northern and southern states in two distinct assemblies; and he carefully avoided determining any particular place or time for such associations. He thus disabled the states for opposing a systematic resistance to his pretensions; and they even became instrumental to his aggrandisement, by causing the ancient parliaments, to which the nobles were still in some degree attached, to fall into oblivion.

The direct influence of these assemblies on the formation of the French government, appears to have consisted in making a transition from the disunion and disorder of a feudal constitution to a moderate, though not strictly a limited monarchy, which should invest the sovereign with the legislative power, but should yet admit the existence of some kind of appeal to public opinion. The importance of their influence in this respect, may be estimated from the description, which Mably has given of the internal state of France, as it existed under Philip IV. and many of the succeeding princes. We see at once, says he, a legislator pretending that the whole nation is subject to his authority, nobles who had not yet renounced their private wars, and the public order so utterly disregarded, that the sovereign was necessitated to give letters of protection, to appoint particular guardians for the defence of churches, monasteries, and cities, and to cause the nobles to guarantee by their power the execution of the royal ordinances. In this state of incoherency the nation must have derived some degree of public feeling from the practice of assembling the states, though not sufficient to qualify it for the construction of a balanced constitution. Accustomed to meet, however irregularly, for the consideration of the public concerns of the state, it at least learned to regard itself as one great community subject to a common government, and was prepared to submit itself without any violent struggle to the dominion of the crown, while it cherished an indistinct persuasion of the existence of certain rights not formally acknowledged.

The very irregularity of the composition of the feudal government appears to have assisted the transformation, which was thus effected by the agency of the states general. Four

great fiefs, Burgundy, Aquitaine, Brittany, and Flanders, though nominally subject to the king, as the feudal superior, were really so independent, that they were rather enemies, than members of the state. The haughty lords of these extensive districts, not choosing to attend in assemblies[4], the only business of which was to supply the necessities of the king, suffered the feudal principles to be destroyed in their absence, while they were themselves regarded as strangers, and even as enemies, by the barons whom they abandoned to the avidity of the prince, and whose burdens they aggravated both by refusing to share them, and by the expenses often rendered necessary by their hostility. The more considerable vassals in this manner separating themselves from the rest, the king was enabled to prosecute his schemes of ambition among the less powerful without interruption, and in due time he found opportunities of suppressing this very irregularity, by uniting to the crown three of these great fiefs, while Flanders, connecting itself with Austria, disengaged itself from the French government, and became a foreign territory.

In that combination of political interests, which was constituted by the governments of France and England, the wars included within the period now under consideration, a struggle of a hundred and eighteen years, interrupted only once, for nine years, by a regular pacification, in which the dominion of France was the prize, twice lost and twice recovered in the conflict, formed naturally the grand crisis of the transformation of the French government. Such a contest could not be waged in the heart of a country, without powerfully influencing the arrangements of its interior policy, for various important changes must in any case have been effected in all its interests by the long continuance of so much violence, and the alternations of success. The influence of these wars was not however the mere result of the persevering aggression of a foreign state, but was considerably modified by various internal dispositions, which rendered the government more or less susceptible of the operation of outward agencies. These were the circumstances tending to ascertain the right of succeeding to the French crown, the hostility of the Flemings, the aggrandisement of

[4] Mably, liv. v. ch. i.

the family of Burgundy, the alienation of the count d'Artois, the rivalry of the petty king of Navarre, and the contest for the duchy of Brittany. For each of these, except the last, some preparation was made by the events, which occurred in the earlier part of the period now under consideration; the case of Brittany required only the ordinary struggle of a disputed succession.

Before the year 1316 no mention had been made of any law for regulating the inheritance of the crown of France, the family of Capet having maintained a lineal transmission of it through male heirs during more than three centuries. But, before the claim of an English monarch should be advanced, it was important that a rule of succession should have been in some degree constituted, which might tend to embarrass that pretension, and thus to assist in delivering the country from a permanent subjugation. The opportunity for establishing such a rule was presented in the succession of the sons of Philip IV., who followed each other in order on the throne of France. Louis X., the eldest, seems to have appeared, upon the throne only to furnish such an occasion, as he died within two years, leaving a daughter his only child. For this daughter the succession was claimed, but it was solemnly determined in favour of[5] the second brother Philip V., that no female could inherit, the first mention of that Salic law[6], which soon became the subject of so much discussion. At the death of Philip, which followed within six

[5] His succession was facilitated by his previous possession of the regency during four months, until the queen was delivered of a son, who however lived but a few days. Sismondi, tome ix. p. 351.

[6] The French writers almost unanimously concur in asserting, that the exclusion of females from the succession of the crown was a fundamental law of the government. The Salic law however relates only to the inheritance of lands, and can be applied to the government only by analogy. On the other hand the great fiefs were universally transmissible to women. Even at the consecration of Philip himself, Maud countess of Artois held the crown over his head among the other peers. And it was scarcely beyond the recollection of persons living, that Blanche had been legitimate regent of France during the minority of Saint Louis, or Louis IX. From these reasons, and much more from the provisional treaty concluded between Philip and the duke of Burgundy (in relation to the rights of the daughter of Louis X.) Mr. Hallam has concluded, that the Salic law, as it was called, was not so fixed a principle at that time, as has been contended.—State of Europe during the Middle Ages, vol. i. pp. 45, 46.

years, his three daughters were set aside in favour of the third brother Charles IV. Seven years afterwards the succession passed from the three daughters of Charles to the collateral branch of Valois.

The regulation of the succession may be considered as a conservative principle of the government. The other internal dispositions, which have been mentioned, tended generally to assist the enterprises of England.

The hostilities of the Flemings was primarily the result of that connexion of commercial interest, which attached them to the English; but this hostility of mere policy was converted into an acrimonious antipathy by events, which occurred in the reigns of Philip IV. and his sons. Philip IV[7]. in resentment of the assistance, which they had afforded to the English, turned his arms against them, and, disregarding a pacification concluded in his name, endeavoured to unite the county to the crown. The attempt gave occasion to a very bloody struggle, in which the animosity of the Flemings was excited to the utmost vehemence, and the war was terminated in the year 1305 by a treaty, which ceded to the French king the country beyond the Lys, and thus maintained the irritation. In such circumstances peace could not be of long continuance, and accordingly we find that the three sons of Philip IV. were all successively engaged in war with the Flemings.

When Philip V. advanced his pretension to the crown as the brother of the deceased king, the claim[8] of the daughter was supported by her uncle the duke of Burgundy; and Philip, though he was able to procure a determination in his own favour, judged it expedient to conciliate the duke by giving him his daughter in marriage, and assigning as her dowry the county of Burgundy, since denominated Franche Comté. The two Burgundies in this manner became united, and a preparation was made for the extraordinary aggrandisement of the family of Burgundy, which afterwards engrossed the rich succession of Flanders and other acquisitions.

The count d'Artois was driven into a connexion with the English immediately in consequence of his own misconduct; but the occasion of that misconduct had been

[7] Abrégé de l'Hist. de France par Daniel, tome iii. pp. 277, &c.
[8] Henault, vol. i. p. 224.

furnished by a litigation, in determining which the personal connexions of three of the earlier princes of this period had probably much influence. The county[9] having become vacant in the year 1302, the succession was claimed by the grandson of the deceased count, whose son, the father of the claimant, had previously died; but the inheritance was adjudged by Philip IV. to a daughter, on the principle that in that county representation, which substitutes the child for the parent, was not admitted, and that the daughter was nearer in relationship than the grandson. This daughter, it should be observed, was married to the count of Burgundy, and two of her daughters were married to two sons of that king, who pronounced the judgment. In the reign of Philip V., one of the princes thus connected with the daughter, the claim of the grandson, who had then attained to maturity, was again urged, and was again rejected as before. The unsuccessful claimant had married a sister of Philip VI., and, when his brother-in-law had become his sovereign, chiefly too by his assistance, he resolved to make a third effort to establish his pretension; but, two decisions having been pronounced against him, he judged it necessary to provide for the king a pretext, which might justify a new examination of the cause. False titles were accordingly prepared by an artful forgery. The fraud was however detected and exposed; and the count, dishonoured by the discovery, fled[10] to the king of England, whom he urged to assert his title to the crown of France.

Navarre, which comprehended territory on both sides of the Pyrenees, had in consequence of a marriage[11] passed to the family of the counts of Champagne in the year 1234, and again by another marriage to Philip IV. of France in the year 1285, the year preceding that in which he succeeded to the French crown. This prince was succeeded in both his kingdoms by his son Louis X.; but after the death of Louis a separation should have been made, and Navarre should have been given to the count d'Evreux, who had married his daughter and heiress. Philip V. however, and

[9] Henault, vol. i. p. 213. Abrègé de l'Hist. par Daniel, tome iii. pp. 392, &c. Abrégé Chron. par Mezeray, tome iii. p. 630. [10] Sismondi attributes his flight to a charge of magical practices against the queen and prince. Hist. des Franc. tome x. p. 77. [11] Henault, vol. i. pp. 190, 205.

after him Charles IV., the brothers of Louis, retained possession of the kingdom, nor did it pass to the count, until at the death of Charles a new branch of the royal family was placed upon the throne of France. The count d'Evreux was succeeded in Navarrè by his son Charles, who has been unfavourably characterised by the appellation of the *bad*[12], and by two successive arrangements concluded with the French government[13], the latter became possessed of various properties, which rendered him very powerful in Normandy. In this manner was the bordering kingdom of Navarre transferred to a prince rendered jealous of the French government by the past detention of his territory, and at the same time possessing districts within France[14], which enabled him to assist most effectually the enterprise of the English. A special occasion of hostility was also furnished to him, for, irritated at seeing the constable of France invested with the dignity of count of Angoulême, which he had resigned in the adjustment of his pretensions, he caused this nobleman to be murdered, and then sought protection for his guilt in a connexion with England. By such combination was this little kingdom, which had primarily formed one of the two distinct sources of the modern government of Spain, and then had maintained a communication of social refinement between the Spanish peninsula and France, rendered at this time instrumental to those agitations of the latter country, which reduced its government to order.

[12] Being a grandson of Louis X. by his daughter, he was nearer to the crown than Edward III. of England, a grandson of Philip IV. the father of Louis. This seems to have suggested his treacheries. Eloquent and insinuating, he was the favourite of the people, whose grievances he affected to pity, and with whose leaders he intrigued.—Hallam, vol. i. pp. 54, 55. [13] The counties of Champagne and Brie, which had been connected with Navarre since it had been inherited by the counts of Champagne, were ceded to Philip VI. in exchange for the counties of Angoulême and Mortain with some other districts; and in the beginning of the reign of John these counties, with the county of Evreux and some other places, were exchanged for Mante and Meulan, both in Normandy.—Abrégé de l'Hist., tome iii. p. 382; tome iv. p. 10. [14] A small part of Navarre itself was on the French side of the Pyrenees, extending eight leagues in length and five in breadth.—Etat de la France, tome ii. p. 355. Lond. 1727. This part of Navarre, being one of the six bailiwicks of which it was composed, remained independent, when Ferdinand of Aragon subdued the remainder. It was united to the crown of France by Henry IV. in the year 1607.—Henault, vol. ii. p. 27.

In Brittany the duke[15], having no children, and being desirous of securing the future tranquillity of his subjects, had selected as the husband of his niece, and his own successor in the duchy, the count de Blois, who was a nephew of the king. At his death, which occurred in the year 1341, this arrangement was resisted by his uncle the count de Montfort, and this domestic contest became a war of twenty-two years, in which the king of England espoused the cause of the count de Montfort, and the king of France that of his adversary. The contest was rendered especially remarkable by the heroism of the two countesses, who gallantly maintained the struggle, when the counts had fallen into the hands of their enemies. Such leaders probably added to the spirit of the war of Brittany, by enlisting on each side the chivalrous sentiment of the people.

While providence, says Henault[16], was preparing the way for one of the longest and most memorable reigns, which England ever beheld, by the succession of Edward III., France saw herself bereft of the last son of Philip IV. Though the Salic law had been recently declared and confirmed, the English monarch on this occasion advanced a pretension to the throne in the right of his mother, a daughter of Philip IV., alleging that, being his grandson, he was more nearly related to him than Philip VI., the son of his brother. To this pretension the Salic law was not directly applicable, because the claimant was a male; but it was held that a female, as she could not inherit, was incapable of transmitting a right of inheritance, and the claim was rejected. It was then relinquished, and hostilities were afterwards commenced on a different occasion; when however military success had added its force to proximity of blood[17], it was again brought forward.

Philip VI., in the first year of his reign, sent to summon the English monarch to perform homage for the territories, which he held in France, and, his envoy having failed to obtain an audience, he took possession of the duchy of Gui-

[15] Abrégé de l'Hist., tome iii. p. 425. [16] Vol. i. p. 234. [17] This claim was liable to strong objections, for there stood in his way Jane, the daughter of Louis X., three daughters of Philip V., and one of Charles IV.; and as the male descendant of a female the son of Jane, afterwards king of Navarre.—Hallam's State of Europe during the Middle Ages, vol. i. p. 47.

enne and the county of Ponthieu. The affair was however compromised, and a war might have been avoided, if the count d'Artois, stung with the shame of his disgrace, had not sought and obtained protection of the king of England. The French king retaliated by giving his protection to David Bruce of Scotland, who had been dethroned by Edward; and in the year 1339 the war was begun by Edward, whom the count was continually soliciting to the enterprise.

The Flemings, though irritated by the dismemberment of their county, were slow in joining the English; but, when Edward had removed the scruples of their allegiance by assuming the title of king of France, and had gratified them by a promise of restoring the district of which they had been deprived, they gave their assistance. Two years after the commencement of the war, the succession of Brittany became vacant, and the contention for the duchy, in which the kings of France and England naturally supported different claimants, extended the theatre of hostility, and multiplied the contending parties.

The war, which was continued to the year 1360, was distinguished by various events favourable to Edward; the memorable victories of Crecy and Poitiers, the capture of the king of France in the engagement fought at the latter of these places, and the reduction of Calais. It was then concluded by the treaty of Bretigni, which ceded to the English monarch in full sovereignty various territories in France[18], that prince renouncing on the other part his pretension to the French throne. The French historians agree in representing Edward[19], as induced to consent to this peace only by the impression, which a tremendous storm, deemed by him a special admonition of heaven, had made upon his mind.

The peace, thus concluded, subsisted only nine years. In that interval John, son and successor of Philip VI., whose extreme imprudence had been a grand cause of the misfortunes and disgraces of his country[20], had been succeeded by

[18] Poitou, Xaintonge, Rochelle, Agenois, Perigord, Limosin, Querci, Reuergue, Angoumois, the counties of Bigorre, Gaure, Ponthieu, and Guines, and the towns of Montreuil and Calsis.—Abrégé de l'Hist. tome iv. p. 78. [19] Ibid., tome iv. p. 77. Abrégé Chron., tome iv. p. 131. Henault, vol. i. p. 254. [20] Abrégé de l'Hist. Ibid., pp. 88, 90.

his son Charles V., a prince gifted by nature with the most excellent qualities, and disciplined to wisdom in the school of adversity. Charles had, during the captivity of his father, been much embarrassed by the intrigues and hostilities of the king of Navarre[21]. Fortunately however for him, in the commencement of his reign, a civil war[22] which broke out in Castile, drew off from him the efforts of this prince[23], and left him at liberty to direct his whole attention to the English. The power of Charles was soon afterwards increased by an arrangement[24], which however had subsequently a contrary operation. The duchy of Burgundy had, in the year following the conclusion of the peace, devolved to John, as the nearest relative, and had by him been given as an appanage to a younger son. The count of Flanders having no other heir than a daughter, Charles V. procured her in marriage for his brother the young duke of Burgundy, relinquishing on this occasion the district of Flanders, which had been formerly ceded to the crown of France, by which arrangement the two Burgundies were eventually united with the entire county of Flanders, in the possession of the brother of the reigning sovereign.

When the king was thus prepared for renewing the war, a pretext was easily found. The reciprocal renunciations, prescribed by the treaty of Bretigni, had not been executed[25]; in the disorder occasioned by this omission numerous malcontents of the English territories appealed to the king of

[21] The pretension which he had to the crown, being nearer than that of Edward, hindered that prince from giving him an effectual support.—Abrégé Chron., tome iv. pp. 114, 115. [22] Henry Count of Transtamare, illegitimate brother of Peter *the Cruel* king of Castile, was in the year 1364 the leader of a revolt, provoked by the numerous outrages, which had procured for the king his dishonourable appellation, and was supported by the kings of Aragon and Navarre.—Abrégé de l'Hist., tome iv., p. 107. [23] Ibid., pp. 107, 138. [24] Ibid., p. 140.

[25] Though an historian sixty years later (Juvenal des Ursins) asserts that the French commissioners attended at Bruges, and that those of Edward made default, it is certainly rendered improbable by the actual appointment of commissioners made by the king of England on the fifteenth of November (the meeting of Bruges was appointed to be held on the thirtieth of that month in the year 1361): by the silence of Charles V., after the commencement of hostilities, who would have rejoiced in so good a plea; and by the language of some English instruments, complaining that the French renunciations were withheld.—Hallam's State of Europe during the Middle Ages, vol. i. pp. 58, 59.

France, as still their superior lord; and Charles, availing himself of the opportunity, summoned to his court, as his vassal, the prince of Wales, to whom the king of England had resigned his provinces of France. The prince having treated the summons with contempt, the king of France[26], encouraged by the war of Castile, which had ruined the English army, immediately commenced hostilities, and, as the ceded provinces were eager to return to their native king, the English were in a few campaigns derived of almost all their conquests, and even in a great degree of their antecedent possessions in Guienne.

Charles V., who thus resumed hostilities, was[27] a wise and able prince, and during the remaining eleven years of his reign France gained a series of successes, which entirely changed the aspect of affairs[28]. This reign indeed was the reign of wisdom, and the result corresponded to such a description. At his accession[29] he found the English and the king of Navarre possessed of the finest provinces of France; at his death he left to the king of Navarre but the single city of Cherbourg, and to the English only Calais, Bordeaux, and some places of less importance. The reign of his son and successor Charles VI. was on the contrary a long period of weakness and calamity, which formed a melancholy alternation of the public fortunes.

The king having ascended the throne in his twelfth year, the government immediately became the prize of the contention of his four uncles, among whom was the powerful duke of Burgundy[30]. In his maturity an unhappy derangement of mind[31] rendered him incapable of conducting the public affairs, except in uncertain intervals of returning reason; and, to complete the misfortunes of the country, his queen engaged so deeply in the factions of the court, that

[26] Sismondi, tome ii. p. 102. [27] Sismondi has recently given a very different character of this prince; but he has admitted, that the general results of his government have caused him to retain the title of *the wise*, which, he says, Christina of Pisa had given him.—Ibid., p. 126. The English monarch strongly supported his pretension. There was never any king of France, he said, who armed himself less, nor any king who has given me so much trouble.—Ibid., p. 176.

[28] Abrégé de l'Hist., tome iv. p. 214. [29] Ibid., p. 222. [30] The others were the dukes of Anjou, Berri, and Bourbon. [31] This was first noticed in the year 1392, at which time the king was twenty-four years old.—Abrégé de l'Hist., tome iv. p. 298.

she at length connected herself with the English, to exclude her own son from the succession. When to a government so paralysed the enterprising vigour of Henry V. of England was opposed, it cannot be deemed surprising that the result should have been the entire loss of its independence.

The war was long maintained but languidly by the English, and at one time was even suspended by a truce for fourteen years. Henry V. did not succeed to the crown of England until the year 1413; nor did the dissensions of the French court drive the duke of Burgundy into open rebellion, until three years more had elapsed. The king of England, who before the junction of the French duke had gained the memorable victory of Agincourt, made afterwards a rapid progress in the reduction of the northern provinces of France; and in the year 1420 was concluded the treaty of Troyes[32], by which it was agreed, that he should marry the daughter of the French king, that he should manage the government during the life of the reigning sovereign, and that after his death he should succeed to the French crown, which from that time should be united to the crown of England.

The union stipulated by the treaty of Troyes was actually effected, but did not long subsist. Henry V. of England, whose heroic spirit had given the impulse to this great revolution, was cut off by a premature death about two years after the conclusion of the treaty, and the unfortunate Charles VI. within the same year followed him to the tomb. Henry VI. of England, then a minor, was after the death of Charles proclaimed king of France[33], the regency of that kingdom being committed to his uncle the duke of Bedford. The son of Charles VI. however, who was of the same name, still maintained his party on the southern side of the Loire, until a most extraordinary agent interposed, and established him on the throne of his ancestors. The young prince was enabled to make this stand against his enemies chiefly by a dissension[34], which had arisen between the duke of Burgundy and the English, and employed in mutual hostility the forces of the confederates.

France had been rescued from Edward III. by the serious

[32] Abrégé de l'Hist., tome iv. pp. 463, 464. [33] The French historians do not reckon this English monarch among their princes.

[34] Abrégé de l'Hist., tome v. pp. 11, 12, 34.

impression, which he received from a tremendous hurricane: the restoration of the government from the more complete success of Henry V., was the work of a moral agency much more extraordinary than the tempest of the material world. A young girl[35] in very humble life, deeply sensible of the degradation of her country, became persuaded that she was specially commissioned to effect its deliverance. Rejected at first as an idle visionary, she persisted in declaring that she was delegated to raise the siege of Orleans, then invested by the English, and to crown the native prince in Rheims, at that time in their possession. When, after some hesitation, her proposal was accepted, she led on the before disheartened troops to the most signal successes, and within the short space of three months astonished her countrymen by the accomplishment of both her promises. Having thus fulfilled what she had conceived to be her appointed office, she would have returned to her primitive obscurity[36], but, unhappily for her, she was persuaded to conduct the French army in

[35] Joan, of Arc, a village in Lorraine, was the daughter of a labourer, and had been always employed in keeping cattle. Duclos supposes that Agnes Sorrel, the celebrated mistress of the king, who is described as more interested than himself for his glory, had devised the plan of engaging this young woman, to pretend a divine commission for the deliverance of France.—Life of Louis XI., vol. i. p. 5. Dublin, 1746. But Mr. Southey argues in favour of his heroine that, if she had been acquainted with any such plan, she could not with that knowledge have executed an enterprise, for which the sincerity of a real enthusiasm was necessary.—Joan of Arc, pref. Her enthusiasm too was of a very regulated kind, such as might be supposed to have arisen from a deliberate conviction, since, when she had accomplished its specific objects, she was with difficulty induced to continue her exertions in the public cause. The credit, which she obtained with the court, is attributed by historians to two proofs of her inspiration, which she exhibited: she discovered the king in a disguise, though she had never before seen him; and a sword, with which she demanded to be armed, was found in an ancient tomb by a search, which she had directed. In corroboration of the argument of Mr. Southey it may be added, that Mr. Hallam (vol. i. pp. 78, 79, note) has assigned cogent arguments from dates, for depriving Agnes Sorrel of the glory of having been instrumental to the deliverance of her country, by dissuading the king from despairing of the kingdom, when Orleans was besieged, though the tradition is as ancient as Francis I. The truth seems to be, that Agnes had rendered herself popular, by using her influence in a generous patronage of merit, and so obtained in return more credit than she could justly claim.

[36] Abrégé Chron., tome iv. p. 469. Henault, vol. i. p. 294.

other enterprises, and being taken by the English, when she was leading an unsuccessful sally from Compiegne, she was condemned and burned as a witch.

Though by the mighty influence of the national enthusiasm, which Joan had excited, the English interest in France had received a fatal shock, it still preserved its existence. At length however its great support, the alliance of the duke of Burgundy, was withdrawn by a reconciliation, which was effected between this nobleman and Charles VII.[37]; and the war, though never formally terminated, ceased in the year 1457[38] to be waged by either nation. The king of England might by the mediation of the duke have obtained Guienne and Normandy[39]; but fortunately for his own country, as for France, he rejected the overture, and in the event retained only Calais[40], the adjacent county of Guisnes, and the empty title of the king of France[41].

In reviewing the operation of this protracted, violent and varied struggle, as it modified the government of France, we perceive it at first bestowing additional importance on those assemblies of the states, which have been described as what a mineralogist would term a transition-form of the constitution, and ultimately giving occasion to the abolition of such conventions, and the final arrangement of a more simple monarchy.

Though it had been acknowledged that the king was invested with the legislative power, the right of imposing taxes had never been conceded by the nation[42], which was on the contrary always careful to stipulate, that its grants were free, and that no precedent should be inferred from them in favour of the crown. Such a precedent might however have been soon inferred, and the right of taxation united with that of legislation, if the wars of England had

[37] Abrégé de l'Hist., tome v. p. 105. [38] In that year the French landed at Sandwich, and carried away some plunder.—Ibid., p. 236.

[39] Ibid., p. 108. [40] Calais and Guisnes were recovered by the French in the year 1558. They had been retained by the English only because they were surrounded by the provinces of the duke of Burgundy, then connected with England by a treaty, and must have been ceded to him by the king of France. Hist. des Franc. tome xiii. p. 559.

[41] This was abandoned on occasion of the enactment of the union of Ireland with Great Britain in the year 1800. [42] Mably, liv. v. ch. i.

not rendered the necessities and demands of the state so considerable, as to excite the discontent and opposition of the people. So violent was this discontent, that, if the reign of Philip VI., in which these wars had their commencement, had been of longer continuance, it would probably have ended with a general insurrection[43], the people uniting with the nobility against the crown. The personal character of this prince, who was severe and impetuous, was also well fitted to arouse such a spirit in the minds of his subjects. In one instance he indulged this disposition to such a degree that, suspecting some nobles of a treasonable correspondence with the English, he caused them to be beheaded without trial, though no example of the capital punishment of a noble had before occurred[44].

A reign thus fitted to provoke discontent by its severity, was succeeded by one well adapted to encourage it by its weakness, John, the unfortunate sovereign defeated and taken prisoner at the battle of Poitiers, being destitute of every talent except military courage. This prince, intimidated by the irritation of the public mind[45], assembled the states general in the very commencement of his reign. Finding the national convention on this occasion intractable, he did not again venture to bring together the entire body, but endeavoured to prevail separately with each district and city, to comply with his demands. This expedient appears not to have been more successful than the former, the strange alterations of the value of the coin indicating great financial embarrassment. At length, in the year 1355, the hostile preparations of the English monarch Edward III. compelled the king of France to make a public appeal to the liberality of his subjects; still however he would not venture to unite in one assembly the whole national representation, but held two distinct meetings, one of the states of the northern, the other of those of the southern provinces.

The states of the year 1355, as they formed the great crisis of the national resistance to the royal power, deserve particular attention. They resolved[46] that a force of thirty thousand men should be levied to oppose the English, and undertook to provide for their pay, in return for which they

[43] Mably, liv. v. ch. i.
[44] Abrégé Chron., tome iv. p. 50.
[45] Mably, liv. v. ch. ii.
[46] Ibid.

obtained from the king an assurance, that certain grievances, which they specified, should be redressed. Anxious also to secure the appropriation of the new assessments to the purposes, for which they had been granted, they named nine commissioners, chosen from the three orders, whom the king was required to consult after the separation of the states, and sent three deputies into each bailiwick to maintain the treaty concluded with the king, and to superintend the collection of the assessments. In these measures their conduct appears to have been firm and judicious. In many particulars however they committed errors, which blasted the hope of reformation. They neglected to require, that the separation of the northern and southern states should be abrogated, and that a general assembly should be annually convened in some appointed place: they rendered the appointment of their commissioners futile[47] by leaving them destitute of the power necessary for the effectual discharge of their duty, and even subjecting them to the king from whom they were to receive commissions, and to the parliament, to which their disputes were referred, and also by requiring an unanimity, which necessarily embarrassed their operations: they employed themselves moreover in proscribing particular abuses[48], which would have ceased of themselves, instead of establishing general principles of liberty, which might have become the landmarks of the public rights: but their great and decisive error was a conditional law, which enacted that, if the next states should refuse to grant to the king the necessary subsidies, he should re-enter into the enjoyment of the rights, which he had renounced, with the single exception of the right of prisage. These stipulations however, incomplete as they were, might yet have been effectual, before the legislative power of the king had been formally acknowledged; but this power[49]

[47] They had not the power of convening the states general, though the commissioners sent to the bailiwicks had that of assembling the provincial states.—Mably, liv. v. ch. ii. [48] The king engaged to reform the coinage, and not to alter it in future; the extortions practised by the officers of the crown were proscribed; the administration of various inferior tribunals was regulated and restrained; and military officers were required to complete their companies.—Ibid. [49] It had not been formally recognised even in the time of Philip IV., who first assembled the states general; but in the reigns of his sons it

had been recognised before the reign of John, and the states, though adverse to his demands of money, allowed his right of legislation.

The states of the year 1355 were followed by those of the succeeding year in yet more urgent circumstances of public distress. The French army had been defeated by the English in the battle of Poitiers, the king taken prisoner, and the dauphin[50] left to manage the government as he might. The proceedings of the states were accordingly more vigorous, than they had been in the preceding year. They began by appointing a committee of grievances, which refused to admit any agents on the part of the king; they then adopted those ordinances, which had been framed by the preceding states for the relief of the public necessities; and, to secure the observance of their stipulations, they required that their adversaries should be dismissed from the administration. This last demand interrupted the negotiation, for the dauphin immediately dissolved the convention, hoping to experience more submission in the meetings of the provinces. Receiving however a peremptory refusal of assistance from the city of Paris, he was forced to convene in one assembly the states of the northern division of the kingdom, by which he was compelled to yield to the obnoxious requisition, and remove twenty-two of the ministers of his father.

But, although the states had thus been enabled, by the increased embarrassment of the government, to act with more success than in the preceding year, they did not adopt

began to be distinctly held that the king could make new laws, but that he could not abrogate the old. It is probable that, as often as Philip VI. and his predecessors assembled the states, the prince and the nation reciprocally declared their wants, and that the king published in his own name the regulations required by his people. Hence, as the ordinances appeared to be the work of the prince alone, the states seem to have begun to think, that they possessed only the power of making remonstrances.—Ibid.

[50] Dauphiné was ceded by its count in the year 1343 in favour of Philip, the second son of Philip VI., and the cession was completed in the year 1349, the count, in his affliction for the loss of his only son, having determined to retire from the world. After this first appointment of a younger son of the king, the title of dauphin was always given to the eldest, but the province was never relinquished to these princes after the year 1440.—Henault, vol. i. pp. 246, 247.

more effectual measures for the establishment of the public liberty. Instead of rendering themselves an ordinary and permanent member of the constitution, they demanded only the privilege of assembling at pleasure during a year, and even for the exercise of this very limited privilege made no provisional arrangement, to determine the mode in which they should be convened: very imperfectly too correcting an error of the former states, they continued to require that at least six of the nine commissioners should be unanimous, and that these six should be composed of persons deputed from each of the three orders: and, in their prosecution of petty grievances, they alienated all the tribunals and magistracies of the kingdom, and created a host of enemies, who united in strict co-operation to frustrate their efforts, as soon as a dissolution of the assembly had deprived them of their collective authority.

That such assemblies should have terminated in the exaltation of the royal power, cannot occasion surprise. Instead of receiving relief from their exertions, the nation was more unhappy after the year 1356, than it had been before[51], and therefore ceased to entertain any hope of advantage from these conventions. The states, on the other hand, conscious that they had forfeited the public confidence, became much more submissive to the crown. A popular insurrection, which under the name of the *jacquerie*[52] began in Paris, and spread through the provinces, favoured this change of conduct by irritating the prelates and the nobles; and the dau-

[51] Mably, liv. v. ch. v. [52] The insurrection was so named according to some from the *jacque*, a linen dress worn by the common people, or according to others from one Jacques Bonhomme their leader.—Abrégé de l'Hist., tome iv. p. 65. According to Mezeray the name was derived from the contemptuous appellation of Jacques Bonhomme, given by the gentry to the peasants.—Abrégé Chron., tome iv. p. 120. This writer has remarked, that the government would have been overthrown, if the towns had joined the insurgents; but that this union was hindered by the fear of pillage. The spirit of insurrection began among the Flemings, who were always tenacious of their privileges, and had then become conscious of their ability to maintain them. To their example Froissart ascribes the tumults, which broke out about the same time in France and England. These were however but separate indications of that general spirit of freedom, which was then rising in those classes, on whom the superior orders of society had long trampled.—Hallam's State of Europe during the Middle Ages, vol. i. pp. 64, 65.

phin availed himself of the crisis with a political ability perfectly suited to his situation. The states of the northern provinces on this occasion voted a subsidy, which was indeed still called a free gift, and which the dauphin, careful to avoid giving offence, consented not to consider as a precedent; but this assembly at the same time abandoned to the prince the whole administration of the government, requiring only that he should act with the concurrence of three of his ministers, who should countersign his orders, or, as is added, should affix their seals, if they should not be able to write; and it also allowed him to dispose of a tenth part of the subsidy agreeably to his own pleasure.

In the precautions then employed by the states we may discover the principles of the responsibility of ministers, and of the separation of a civil list from the general expenditure of the nation; these were however unavailing in a government, in which no regular control was exercised, by which they could be rendered operative. Immediately afterwards a revolution was effected in Paris in favour of the dauphin, who was received into the city without conditions; and, the provinces imitating the example of the capital, he was in the following year enabled to address himself in terms of authority to another convention of the northern states. The peace of Bretigni, concluded in the year 1360, having restored John to his throne, this monarch received from his son, after all these struggles, much more power than any of his predecessors had enjoyed. He imposed various taxes without holding any assembly of the states, appointing also his own officers to superintend the collection; and, when he did convene such an assembly, it confined itself to requests and remonstrances, while the king deliberated only with his council.

John died within four years from his restoration. The reign of his successor, Charles V., became the period of the aggrandisement of the parliament, which was then exalted on the ruin of the states general. This prince, who as dauphin had governed the kingdom during the captivity of his father, had sufficiently experienced their spirit of resistance to the royal power, to resolve to effect the entire suppression of the assemblies of the states[53]. With this view he con-

[53] Mably, liv. vi. ch. i. This policy is by Sismondi attributed to

vened only the states of particular districts, and, that he might efface the recollection of the states general, he went solemnly to the parliament, and held there assemblies, which have been since denominated *beds of justice*. As there were no national assemblies under any of the kings of the third race before Philip IV., the predecessors of that prince, to give greater force to their ordinances, had been used to go themselves to publish them in the parliament of the capital, or the supreme court of justice. This practice was revived by Charles V., who also rendered these extraordinary meetings in some degree images of the national assemblies, by convening prelates, lords, and some *notable* or principal citizens of Paris, together with the magistrates, who regularly composed the court.

Never was any prince better qualified than this monarch to effect such a change in the constitution of his country, for he well knew how to conceal his ambition under the veil of patriotism, and managed the temper of the nation with so much dexterity, that in executing his plans of aggrandisement he appeared to act only in obedience to the public sentiment. The measures of his domestic policy were at the same time powerfully supported by the success, with which he acted against the foreign enemy of his people, as he contrived to wrest from the English almost all the territory, which had been ceded to them by the treaty of Bretigni[54].

It would at the first view seem, that the progress of the government towards the full establishment of the royal power, must have experienced a very considerable interruption in a reign of a character so very different, as that of the succeeding prince, Charles VI. This king having ascended the throne in the thirteenth year of his age, and being in his more advanced life subject at intervals to frenzy, his reign was an almost unvarying scene of domestic faction, which was terminated by the decisive successes of Henry V. of England, and the treaty of Troyes concluded in the year 1420.

Charles VII., as consequent to his recovery of Normandy and Guienne, and adopted then, in 1450, because he had found in the states of 1439 a power superior to his own. Hist. des. Franc. tome xiii. p. 523.

[54] The English at his death retained possession only of Calais, Bourdeaux, and some other places of less importance.—Abrégé de l'Hist., tome iv. p. 222.

But Mably has on this occasion made a remark [55], similar to one which he had before made concerning the weakness of the successors of Charlemagne, observing that the weakness of Charles VI., in the peculiar circumstances of France, served to maintain, and even to increase, the authority of the crown. While the feudal government continued to be vigorous, the administration was little sought, and even in the reign of John the ministers, whose dismission was required by the states, were very obscure men; but, when Charles V. had attained to the possession of arbitrary power, to share the management of public affairs became the object of the great, who accordingly struggled with their utmost power for the possession of the prize. In this state of affairs a prince capable of resisting the pretensions of the greater nobles must have been exposed to the most violent shocks of faction, and, if he were not compelled to submit to some limitations of his authority, must at least have been unable to enlarge it by additional powers. The feeble reign of Charles VI. on the contrary allowing an ample field for the ambition of the leaders of parties all conceived, it to be their own interest to augment the authority, of which they were eager to secure to themselves the exclusive management.

Though Charles VII. was not equally incapable as his father, he was yet of a passive character, which long continued this indulgence of the ambition of the great. The splendid successes of his reign have procured for him the appellation of the *victorious*, but he had little personal claim to the distinction. Devoted to festive gratification [56], he was rather a spectator, than an actor, in the restoration of his country, and the primary agent of the revolution was a female of obscure condition. Under such a prince the great nobles would naturally continue to exalt a power, which they regarded as their own, while the acquiescence of the nation would be conciliated by the popularity of a successful go-

[55] Liv. vi. ch. iv. Of that earlier period he had remarked, ' on ne refusoit pas de prêter la foi et l'hommage, parce qu'on y étoit accoûtumé, mais on violoit ses engagemens sans scrupule, parce qu' on pouvoit le faire impunément.'—Liv. ii. ch. v. [56] One day, when La Hire came to give him an account of some very important affair, the king showed him the preparations made for a banquet, and asked his opinion. I think, said La Hire, that it is impossible to lose a kingdom with more gaiety.—Henault, vol. i. p. 306.

vernment. In this reign accordingly the sovereign was first furnished with the two great resources of dominion[57], a standing army and the power of imposing taxes. The military force consisted of nine thousand men, and the annual taxes at the death of Charles VII. amounted to one million eight hundred thousand francs, or about seventy-two thousand pounds of the money of England.

The reign of the next monarch, Louis XI., constituted a new period of the advancement of the royal authority. The great, assisted by the returning prosperity of the country, had exalted the prerogative, but only with the intention of possessing it in the name of the prince; and for the real aggrandisement of the power of the sovereign a prince was required, who should reduce them to a subordination compatible with his own exercise of the prerogative, which they had so augmented. For such an enterprise Louis was eminently qualified both by his natural character, and by the circumstances of his early life. By nature imperious, he was strongly disposed to throw off the yoke, which the nobles had imposed; and formed by his situation in youth to the habitual practice of dissimulation and cunning[58], he was prepared to avail himself of all the arts of policy. The natural haughtiness of his character had given occasion to his acquired dissimulation[59], for, presuming on his talents and his services, he formed a party in opposition to his father, and was on that account compelled to seek, during almost six years, a retreat in the court of Burgundy. To the discipline of this exile an important influence has been ascribed by the interesting annalist of this period[60], who has particularly contrasted to the frivolous education, commonly received by the princes of France, the solid advantages conferred by the embarrassments, which were then experienced by Louis.

[57] Philip de Comines, liv. vi. ch. vii. Abrégé de l'Hist., tome v. pp. 171, 172. Comines remarks, that this standing army was raised in imitation of the princes of Italy, the habits of commerce having there introduced the practice, while they furnished the means, of supporting mercenary forces. Sismondi represents the *taille* as arbitrarily continued by the king, though granted only for a limited time. Hist. des Franc. tome xiii. pp. 454, 467. [58] It became his maxim, that the man who did not know how to dissemble, was unfit to govern.—Duclos, vol. ii. p. 338. [59] Ibid., vol. i. pp. 11, 60. [60] Comines, liv. i. ch. x.

At the accession of this prince the royal power was parcelled among a number of nobles, who were[61] all sprung from the blood royal, almost all from the sons or daughters of king John; and was at the same time rivalled, on two opposite sides of the kingdom, by the powerful dukes of Brittany and Burgundy. Brittany, itself a very considerable province, was yet more formidable as it afforded to the English, its natural auxiliaries, an easy admission into the heart of the country. The extended dominions of the duke of Burgundy, which through Flanders presented also another entrance to that people, commanded much of the frontier of France on the north and on the east. Usurped internally by the great men, who still affected the obedience of subjects, and externally resisted by the two yet greater nobles, who scarcely acknowledged even a nominal dependence, the power of the sovereign required the interposition of a very able prince, assisted by very favourable circumstances. Louis soon brought forward the crisis, by which the result was determined, for he began his reign with the abrupt dismission of all those, who had been the ministers of his father. This measure has been condemned by Philip de Comines as impolitic[62]; but, though the king appears to have acted under the influence of his original vehemence of character, instead of practising the policy, which he had learned in his exile, he, however unintentionally, prepared by this very measure the struggle, which ended in the full establishment of his power. The dismissed ministers irritated at their loss of power, associated with the princes for their mutual support; the dukes of Burgundy and Brittany were induced to give their assistance in waging, what was most unfitly denominated *the war of the public good*[63]; and Louis in the third

[61] The families of the peers, who had been the ancient rivals of Hugh Capet, had been long extinct, or deprived of their fiefs: the great barons, or nobles of the second order, had not long survived them: and the throne was at this time resisted by its own offspring. Hist. des Franc. tome xiv. p. 377. [62] Comines, ch. x. [63] When most of the demands of provinces, lands, places, and pensions, had been conceded by the king, the princes of the league proceeded to speak of the public good, but came to no decision, and the people were even subjected to additional oppression, for satisfying the rapacity of those, who professed to be their protectors. Dammartin, one of the confederates, said to another of them, the duke of Burgundy, that this league had been the league of the public mischief.—Duclos, vol. i. p. 188.

year of his reign found himself committed in a contest, which must terminate either in the exaltation, or in the suppression, of the royal authority.

The subjects of the house at Burgundy at that time enjoyed wealth and prosperity beyond any other people[64]; such indeed was the splendour[65], which commercial opulence had introduced among them, that the pompous ceremonial began in the court of Burgundy, which was afterwards adopted in that of Austria, and was from the latter transmitted to Castile. The actual family[66] of Burgundy had governed the duchy during a century, in which time very numerous and considerable acquisitions of territory had been effected. A marriage[67] of the first duke of that family with the daughter of the count of Flanders, who was also widow of the last duke of an extinct family of Burgundy, had a century before[68] added to his duchy Flanders, Artois, and Franche Comté, with Nevers, Rethuel, Mechlin, and Antwerp. His grandson acquired by purchase Namur and Luxemburgh, by inheritance Brabant and Limburgh, and by a pretended claim in the right of his mother, Hainault, Holland, Zealand, and West Friesland. His great-grandson, who was contemporary to Louis XI., added Guelderland and Zutphen by a purchase, and thus extended his territories from the frontier of Provence to the shore of the German ocean, a formidable range of territory, as it comprehended so much of the industry and opulence of that period.

It was the wish of this last duke to form his territories into an independent kingdom, and for this purpose he had entered into a negotiation with the German emperor, by whom he was to be advanced to the regal dignity; but the scheme was defeated by the intrigues of the French king, and by the mutual suspicions of the emperor and the duke.

[64] Comines, liv. i. ch. ii. [65] Duclos, vol. i. p. 29. [66] The duchy, having devolved to the crown, was granted in the year 1363 to a younger son of John, then king of France. [67] Coxe's Hist. of the House of Austria, vol. i. pp. 285, &c. [68] The duchy consisted of the Dijounois, or the baillages of Dijon, Beaune, Nuits, Auxonne, and St. John de Laune; the Autunnois or the baillages of Autun, Mont Cenis, Semuren, Briennois, and Bourbon Lanci; the Châlonnois, with the Bresse Châlonnoise; the Auxois, in which were comprised the baillages of Semur, Avalon, Arnai le Duc, and Saulieu; and the Pays de Montagne.—Ibid.

If this kingdom had been established, and had been able to maintain its existence, the relations of the European system must have been considerably disturbed, as the Netherlands in that case would not have been connected with the Spanish government, and the Dutch provinces would therefore not have received that impulse of bigotry and persecution, to which they owed the existence and the importance of their independent republic; nor can we suppose that the mutual relations of France and Germany would not also have been disturbed, if a considerable kingdom had thus been interposed between them, with distinct interests, to be protected by new combinations.

A different destiny, better suited to the federative policy of Europe, awaited this assemblage of various territories. It was dissolved at the death of this duke, and while the French king[69] annexed to his crown the duchy of Burgundy, as forfeited by the treason of the last possessor, the other territories were by the marriage of his daughter transferred to the family of Austria. That some part at least of those other territories was not by such a marriage united to the crown of France, was the result of various contingencies. Mary, the daughter of the last duke, was thirteen years older than the dauphin, who at the death of the duke was but in his seventh year. Notwithstanding this impediment, Louis negotiated a matrimonial alliance, and had even, says his biographer[70], obtained the consent of the heiress; but either her love[71] for the archduke Maximilian, or resentment[72] excited in her mind by the conduct of Louis, determined her to give her hand to the son of the emperor. This marriage having produced two children, Philip the father of the emperor Charles V. and a daughter named Margaret, a matrimonial treaty was concluded for an alliance between the daughter and the dauphin, which would have transferred to the crown of France[73] Franche Comté and Artois, with

[69] Henault, vol. ii. p. 308. [70] Duclos, vol. ii. p. 184. [71] Coxe's Hist. of the House of Austria, vol. i. p. 288. [72] Duclos, vol. ii. p. 184. [73] The death of Mary, occasioned by falling from her horse, had rendered the Flemings indifferent to the interests of Maximilian and his son; and they were therefore well disposed to diminish the power of the young duke, that they might enjoy greater liberty. For this reason, when the king of France required only Artois as a dowry, they added Franche Comté, Masconnois, Auxerrois, and Charolois.—Abrégé de l'Hist., tome v. p. 413. Abrégé Chron., tome iv. p. 665.

some less considerable districts; but the young prince having succeeded to the throne of France, declined to perform the engagement, that he might connect himself with the heiress of Brittany. In this manner was the powerful principality of the Burgundian dukes very unequally partitioned between the two neighbouring monarchies. It had hung on the frontier of France as long as it could contribute to the development of the government of that country, and was then distributed between the adjacent states in the manner most suitable to the general development of the European system.

It is remarkable that both the engagements of the French king, Charles VIII., were specially fitted to excite that animosity between France and the empire, which afterwards produced effects so important. The lady, in regard to whom that prince violated his contract, after she had resided seven years in the French court, as his intended bride, was the daughter of the emperor Maximilian; and the other, whom he married, had been affianced to that prince.

The personal character of the last duke of Burgundy was remarkably instrumental in the ruin of a state, which had been eminently prosperous under the government of his predecessors. Charles, surnamed the *bold* because he delighted in war, was very desirous of directing his hostility against the king of France, and had even, three years before the death of his father[74], entered into a confederacy for this purpose with the duke of Brittany; but he was also ambitious of obtaining from the emperor a grant of the royal dignity, which that prince was supposed to have power to bestow, and, being exasperated by the disappointment[75], which he experienced in regard to this favourite object, he engaged in a succession of German enterprises, terminating in a disastrous war with the Swiss. It was suggested to Louis[76], that his adversary had entered upon a career, in which he would probably exhaust his powers, and that he should suffer him to proceed in it without any direct molestation. The event justified the counsel. The military strength of the duke was wasted against the mountaineers of Swisserland, and, struggling to maintain himself with the feeble remnant of his forces, he afterwards perished in Lorraine.

[74] Comines, liv. i. ch. i. [75] Coxe's Hist. of the House of Austria, vol. i. p. 287. [76] Comines, liv. iv. ch. i.

Among the circumstances, which favoured the policy of Louis XI., must be mentioned the domestic war of the two royal houses of England, which diverted the efforts of that country. This indeed was not sufficient for entirely preventing an embarrassing interposition: but the French king took care to secure by money the indolent and voluptuous Edward IV. and his principal ministers[77]; and on one occasion[78], when the English monarch had at last brought a gallant army to co-operate with the duke of Burgundy, the German enterprises of the duke disappointed the design.

The duke of Brittany still preserved his independence; but the reign of Louis had been, with only this exception, successful in the suppression of the adversaries of the royal power. At home this prince saw himself delivered from all his chief enemies[79]; several of them he had himself removed by judicial executions, and in the course of succession he had become possessed of the properties of others. The formidable power[80], which had been collected on the northern and eastern border of his kingdom, was dissipated in consequence of the discomfiture and death of the duke of Burgundy. The popular feeling too was favourable to the policy of the monarch, for the nation, tired of the assemblies of the states[81], suffered him to dictate their proceedings, and the reality of his power was exemplified in the increase and multiplication of the taxes[82]. The death of the duke of Brit-

[77] A pension of fifty thousand crowns was punctually paid in London to Edward, who was permitted to call it a tribute. Seventy-five thousand crowns were also paid to him when in France, which the English called a fine for that kingdom. Pensions, amounting annually to sixteen thousand crowns, were distributed among the officers of his court; and considerable presents were also given to those officers, and to all ambassadors, and to every person sent from the English government. The acquittances of all the English officers, except the High Chamberlain, who was too cautious to give one, were in the Chamber of Accounts at Paris.—Comines, liv. vi. ch. i. [78] Ibid., liv. iv. ch. v.

[79] Ibid., liv. v. ch. xii. [80] The house of Savoy was at the absolute disposal of the duke of Burgundy; the duke of Milan was his ally; René, king of Sicily, intended to make him his heir, and to deliver Provence to him; so that, if he had been successful in the war commenced with the Swiss, he would have commanded all the adjacent countries from the German Ocean to the Mediterranean, including Lorraine and Provence.—Ibid., liv. v. ch. i. [81] Mably, liv. vi. ch. iv.

[82] Louis XI. raised four millions seven hundred thousand livres annually, whereas Charles VII. had never levied more than one million eight hundred thousand.—Henault, vol. i. p. 324.

tany, and the subsequent marriages of his daughter, first to Charles VIII., and afterwards to his successor Louis XII., which in the year 1491 gave to Charles VIII. the possession of the duchy, and continued it to Louis XII.[83], supplied what was yet deficient, and left the sovereign without any rival of his authority.

The power of the great, which in the reign of Charles VII. had been instrumental to the aggrandisement of the sovereign, and had then been repressed by the royal authority in that of Louis XI., was in the succeeding reign of Charles VIII. rendered an established part of the constitution, in that subordinate condition to which it had been reduced. Louis was sensible that they had been confounded, not subdued[84]; and therefore thought it expedient to direct, that his son should not adopt any measure without the advice and concurrence of the princes of the royal family, and of the great officers of the crown. Thus the absolute monarchy of Louis XI. was tempered by a species of aristocracy in the reign of Charles VIII., but of a very submissive character. When the states general were convened at the accession of this prince[85], the nobility and gentry delivered their petitions on their knees, and granting, without any opposition, the required supply of two millions and a half of francs, entreated that they might be again assembled at the end of two years, to provide whatever further sum the king should deem necessary, a request conceded, but not observed. The union of the great fiefs to the crown had at this time so modified the aristocracy of France, that it could assume a settled position in the general frame of the government, no great lordship remaining to disturb the order of the monarchy.

The parliament, which had been much aggrandised by Charles V. in his desire of superseding the states general, became perpetual in the feeble and turbulent reign of Charles VI.[86], the magistrates, who composed it, holding their places during their lives, or at least during the reign of

[83] The incorporation of the province with the monarchy was formally completed in the year 1532.—Hist. des Franc. tome xvi. p. 402.

[84] Mably, liv. vi. ch. iv. [85] Comines, liv. v. ch. xviii. [86] Mably, liv. vi. ch. v. Sismondi ascribes to Louis XI. the formal establishment of the independence of the parliament, referring it to the year 1467. Hist. des Franc., tome xiv. pp. 250, 316.

the king, and having acquired the right of presenting to the king the persons, whom they desired to be admitted into the body. The nation, at this time disappointed by the states general[87] and weary of anarchy, looked to the parliament for protection; the confidence of the public drew upon it the attention of the government, as it seemed capable of affording the support of public opinion; and the different factions, which successively possessed themselves of the royal authority, endeavoured to procure the appearance of its approbation, by causing their ordinances to be inserted in its registry. The practice of deliberating on the measures of the government probably began in the latter part of this disastrous reign, apparently in imitation of the states general. In the reign of Charles VII. expressions of disapprobation, accompanying the insertion in the registry, were understood to weaken in some degree the authority of a law; and Louis XI., though probably but with the design of evading an application of the duke of Burgundy, alleged on one occasion the necessity of registering the royal edicts. Thus the decline and ruin of the states general, the weakness and disorder of the reign of Charles VI., the factious contentions of ambitious nobles, and the policy of a crafty sovereign, all co-operated to favour the growing pretensions of the parliament; and the public, apprehensive of the excesses of arbitrary power, saw with pleasure a new barrier erected between them and the despotism of the royal council.

The parliament thus constituted served to protect the kingdom from the mischiefs, which might have been caused, either by the factions of the great, or by the discontent of the people[88]. The restoration of the power of the nobles, whose influence on the public opinion had been much augmented by their successful exertions in the expulsion of the English, might have renewed the lawless violence of former ages, if a body had not existed, which owed its importance

[87] The states general were first assembled in the year 1303, and for the last time in the year 1614; but the regular convention of the states ceased from the year 1358 by the great confusion, which the successes of the English had occasioned.—Abrégé Chron., tome iv. p. 119. After this time they were assembled only for the purpose of authorising some specific measures of the government, not for assisting in its ordinary administration. [88] Mably, liv. vi. ch vi.

to the authority of law[89], and was therefore interested in maintaining the principles of regular government. The same body also, by presenting to the people the hope of constitutional protection, disposed them to refrain from those movements of sedition, which otherwise would probably have resulted from their discontents, and thus inclined them to a peaceable and orderly submission. In the popular reign of Louis XII. it served likewise to moderate a contrary propensity of the nation[90], which had become tired of its struggles against the authority of the crown. Emboldened perhaps by observing that the states general had ceased to be assembled, possibly excited by the multiplied abuses of the royal power, it began to oppose itself to the general tendency, by which the nation was carried to an implicit acquiescence in the will of the sovereign.

The series of reigns, comprehended within the period of this chapter, was concluded by that of Louis XII., whose affectionate concern for the happiness of his subjects procured for him the truly glorious appellation of father of his people[91] Such a reign was well fitted to tranquillise the government after the agitations, to which it had been so long exposed, and to bring the several orders of the state into some degree of national union. Much indeed of the ten years, which it lasted, was occupied in engagements of foreign policy, which had been begun by his immediate predecessor; but, as it was in its interior administration a reign of conciliation[92], so its foreign engagements must

[89] The parliament was employed by successive kings in forming a digest of the various customs, observed in the several provinces of France. The order was issued by Charles VII. in the year 1453, and the work was begun under Charles VIII. in the year 1495, but it was not completed until more than a hundred years had elapsed from the death of the former. Though we should include only the principal varieties, we should find at least sixty, for the greatest part very different.—Mably, liv. vi. ch. vi. [90] Ibid., liv. vii. ch. iii. [91] He in particular remitted one half of the taxes, and never imposed any new, but defrayed the expenses of his foreign expeditions by an extreme parsimony.—Henault, vol. i. p. 353. Daniel says that he reduced the taxes by a tenth part at his accession, and afterwards by a third, which reductions would leave three-fifths, or rather more than the half of the original assessments.—Abrégé de l'Hist. tome vi. p. 2. He provided however one injudicious resource in the place of taxes, by the sale of financial offices.—Abrégé Chron., tome v. p. 121.

[92] In this spirit he began his reign, telling Louis de la Trimouille, who

have contributed to the suppression of domestic animosities.

When the French government had been reduced to order, it was in the natural course of human policy, that the new-felt vigour of the country should be exercised in some enterprise of foreign aggrandisement, for in nations, as in individuals, active exertion is the result of a consciousness of strength, and war is the most obvious, and the most usual, activity of states. It is not therefore surprising, that France should have been immediately engaged in the combinations of foreign policy with some or other of the neighbouring governments. It might indeed be concluded, that England should have been at this time the object of French enterprise. England had waged with France a long series of hostilities, and for a time had actually possessed itself of the government of the country; and it seems natural that France should have turned upon its ancient enemy, and caused it to experience in its turn the miseries of war. The efforts of France were however directed against Italy, while England was left to compose at leisure her domestic struggle of the rival families of Lancaster and York, in the establishment of that of Tudor on the throne.

The weakness of Italy, resulting from its manifold divisions, naturally presented encouragement to the enterprise of the neighbouring people. Some special circumstances also stimulated the ambition of the two French princes, Charles VIII. and Louis XII.

The establishment of the family of Anjou on the throne of Naples had prepared the pretension, which first prompted the invasions of the French. When that family had been expelled by the family of Aragon, the deposed prince, having retired to France, and leaving no male issue, bequeathed his rights to a son of his brother; and he also, leaving no issue, transmitted them by a similar appointment to Louis XI. of France, who was the son of a sister of the same prince. Louis indeed, contented with the acquisition

had defeated and taken him prisoner before his accession, that it did not become the king of France to avenge the quarrels of the duke of Orleans, which had been his dignity. He had for his coat of arms a royal bee surrounded by a swarm, with this Latin inscription, *non utitur aculeo rex cui paremus.*—Henault, vol. i. pp. 338, 346

of Provence, which had been conveyed by the bequest, neglected the Italian pretension, by which it was accompanied; but the prospect of acquiring another sovereignty proved more attractive to the mind of his youthful successor Charles VIII., especially as he was strongly urged to the enterprise by Louis Sforza, uncle of the young duke of Milan, who, in planning the ruin of his nephew, found it necessary to endeavour to ruin also the king of Naples, the young duke being married to the daughter of that prince. In this manner was Charles VIII. induced to undertake, in the year 1494, his Italian expedition, in which his progress was an almost unresisted triumph, his return a continued escape.

To Louis XII., who succeeded Charles VIII., another pretension was added, the object of which was the great duchy of Milan in the northern part of Italy. Being of a collateral branch of the royal family[93], he inherited from a grandmother a claim to that duchy, which was then possessed by Francis Sforza, who had married an illegitimate daughter of the last duke. As the attempt of Charles VIII. to assert his pretension to the kingdom of Naples had been disastrous, it seems to have been requisite that the ambition of his successor should be stimulated by an additional claim, particularly belonging to his own part of the royal family, the object of which, being nearer, might seem more attainable, and might also appear to facilitate the acquisition of that, which was more remote. The enterprise of Louis was not more successful than that of his predecessor. By the double engagement however of the two pretensions, the French government became at once involved in all the combinations of Italian policy.

That combination of France and England, which had been begun by the enterprise of the duke of Normandy, had at this time produced its effects on the internal arrangements of the two governments. It had first in England established a feudal sovereignty, and yet assisted the efforts

[93] Valentine, a princess of Milan, married the duke of Orleans, a son of Charles V. of France, on which occasion it was stipulated, that the succession of Milan should devolve to her, if her brother should die without heirs, as actually occurred. Louis XII. as the grandson of Valentine, inherited her pretension.

of liberty by the embarrassment of foreign possessions; it had then reacted upon France, in which it appears to have provided a favourable opportunity for the formation of a more orderly monarchy, than the circumstances of the country would otherwise have permitted to exist; and the war with France had at the same time other operations on the domestic concerns of England, favourable to the development of its political interests, as shall be explained in the following chapter. When these things had been accomplished, the functions of the combination were discharged, and any further operation would have but generated disturbance and confusion.

In this state of things the wars of Italy gave another direction to the forces of France, more agreeable to the actual circumstances of that country. The time had arrived, when it might enter into relations, which were soon to be matured into a general system of federative policy. The principles of this policy could be found only amidst the superior refinement, and the multiplied relations, of the numerous states of Italy. To that country accordingly was the enterprise of France directed by the causes, which have been mentioned; and it was at the same time diverted from England, where no further advantage could have been received from its continued action.

When we observe France in this manner drawn off from that combination with England, which had fulfilled its functions, and connected in a new combination with both extremities of Italy, in which country alone it could begin to engage itself in the relations of a federative policy, we seem to be surveying one of those complicated machines, invented to abbreviate the processes of human labour, in which the same part of the engine is made to perform successively different operations, with a promptness and a fitness, that emulate the living intelligence of man.

CHAPTER VI.

Of the history of England, from the beginning of the reign of Edward II. in the year 1307, *to that of the reign of Henry IV. in the year* 1399.

Edward II. king in the year 1307—deposed, 1327, and succeeded by Edward III.—War with France begun, 1339—House of Commons formed, 1343—Wicliffe began to teach in 1360—Richard II. king, 1377—Insurrection of the populace, 1381—First English translation of the Bible published by Wicliffe about the same time—The king deposed, 1399.

THE history of the English government has been traced to the successive introduction of the two distinct classes of the representative members of the legislature, the knights of shires and the burgesses. These two classes however did not at first constitute one assembly, separated from the temporal lords and prelates, but seem to have existed only as the elements of a future combination, which was effected within the period to be considered in the present chapter. The reign of Richard II., with which this period is concluded, evinced the importance of the new assembly of representatives, even by the efforts which the king successfully employed to corrupt its independence.

Of the three reigns now to be considered, the first and the third have a remarkable resemblance, and are not less remarkably contrasted to the intermediate one of Edward III., both Edward II. and Richard II. having been weak and incapable princes, both ultimately driven from the throne, whereas the reign of Edward III., which was extended to the extraordinary length of fifty years, was successful abroad and useful at home, and constitutes one of the most brilliant periods of English history. We thus observe two successive alternations of illustrious and feeble sovereigns, the imbecility of Edward II. having immediately followed the glorious government of the first prince of that name, as the weakness of Richard II. succeeded the splendid rule of the third Edward.

These alternations may be easily shown to have been favourable to the formation of a mixed constitution, by which

various powers were to be combined in very complicated relations. The principles of political activity, elicited in the reign of an able and enterprising sovereign, find an opportunity of more free exercise in the weakness of an incapable successor, but would probably become mischievously violent, if this liberty should be continued through two successive reigns. Though another able and enterprising prince may again excite new energies in the social system, yet under such a government all the various agencies of the state will be retained in their subordination, and hindered from producing disturbance and confusion. When public order had been restored by the vigorous government of Edward I., the principles of a sound legislation had been established, and the materials of our mixed constitution had been completed, the contrasted government of Edward II. proved accordingly most directly favourable to the further growth and improvement of that constitution, by affording to the yet humble representatives of the popular interests the opportunity of acquiring political importance.

The weakness of Edward II. became manifest in the very commencement of his reign. Retiring from Scotland, which his father had prepared to subdue for the third time, and disbanding the powerful army provided for the enterprise, he at once convinced his subjects of the entire incapacity of their sovereign. His whole reign of twenty years was consonant to the beginning. Devoted in succession to two unworthy favourites, Piers de Gaveston and Hugh le Despenser, he abandoned to their rapacity and mismanagement the interests of his people, and in supporting them against the popular hatred engaged himself in a struggle, which at length destroyed his own authority, drove him from the throne, and deprived him of life.

All the European kingdoms[1], especially that of England, were at this time unacquainted with the office of a prime minister; and a prince so feeble as Edward II., had no other means of procuring tranquillity, than the dangerous expedient of devolving his whole authority upon some great baron, who should be able to maintain with his own power the ascendency of the crown. For supplying this deficiency of political arrangement preparation was made by the strug-

[1] Hume, vol. ii. pp. 359, 360.

gles, which were provoked by the unworthy favourites of this incapable prince. These struggles may be considered as the prototypes of the constitutional interference of the parliament in the selection of the ministers of the crown, irregular indeed and violent, as the constitution was yet very imperfectly formed, and the habits of all the classes of the people were disorderly and tumultuary, but still tending to dispose the minds of men to exercise a more peaceable and legitimate interposition in the management of the executive government, when a more perfect constitution, and improved political habits, should have qualified them for such proceedings. The power of the crown being delegated to persons wholly unable to maintain themselves against the opposition of the nobles, and provoking public animadversion by their misconduct, the abuses of the government became subjects of parliamentary inquiry, and the formal deposition of the sovereign, which concluded the struggle, established the supreme control of the legislative assembly of the nation.

The commons[2] in the second parliament of this king, appended to their vote of a subsidy the unprecedented demand, that their petition for the redress of their grievances should be previously granted. Appeals also were made by both parties to the opinion of the public, and the archbishop of Canterbury[3] even vindicated the final proceedings of the last parliament in a sermon, the text of which was 'the voice of the people the voice of God.' The first perfect copy too of a coronation-oath, which has been transmitted to us, is of that which was administered to Edward II. As this prince had already manifested his incapacity, and his attachment to a favourite, so that he had provoked a combination of the nobles, by which his coronation was delayed, it is probable that some more special precaution was then employed, than had been before perceived to be necessary. In this oath the rights of the people are claimed as established by the laws of Edward the Confessor, without any reference to the charter of John, which appears to have been considered only as a confirmation of the ancient usages; and the king is required to observe and enforce all the statutes, which the community of his kingdom should judge fit to enact.

[2] Lingard, vol. iii. p. 386. [3] Parliam. Hist., vol. i. p 186.

The right of deposing the king for incapacity was first maintained in the year 1321 by the lords[4], who confederated to crush the two Despensers, the favourite and his father; but the banishment of these two obnoxious individuals was the only measure of severity, on which they insisted. Six years afterwards however the principle was carried into execution by the queen, jealous of the ascendency, which these men had gained over the mind of her husband, who had soon revoked the sentence of their banishment, and reinstated them in their former power. That the queen should have been the chief agent in this revolution was important to the general stability of the government, as it hindered the precedent of parliamentary interposition from becoming popular with the nation. The public feeling was shocked[5], when she was seen deserting a husband, whose only crime was his natural incapacity, associating herself with the enemies of him, whom she was bound to cherish and support, and rendering her young son an instrument of a conspiracy formed against the dignity of his father; and the persuasion justly entertained, that she had engaged in a criminal intercourse with the leader of the discontented nobles, exalted into indignation and hatred the moral disgust of the people. The cruel murder of the deposed king filled up the measure of the public reprobation, and completed the unpopularity of a precedent, which might else have been too acceptable in a nation, just rising to the enjoyment of a free government.

As the vigorous reign of the first Edward had been necessary for the re-establishment of order and the improvement of the government, after the long series of agitations, by which the kingdom had been harassed during several preceding reigns, so was another reign of authority and success, after the more violent struggles of that of the second Edward, most necessary for the preservation and further improvement of the constitution. Such accordingly was the character of that of the third prince of this name, the long duration of which also, even exceeding that of the first Edward, allowed full time for the operation of its salutary influence.

England enjoyed[6], by the prudence and vigour of Edward

[4] Rapin, vol. i. p. 389. [5] Hume, vol. ii. p. 375. [6] Ibid. p. 511.

III., a longer continuance of domestic tranquillity, than any with which she had been blessed in any former period, or than she experienced in many following ages. Such a continued maintenance of order would of itself have been very favourable to the adjustment of a government, in which contending interests were struggling for their situations. But a very imperfect conception would be formed of the reign of this illustrious monarch, if it were limited to the mere consideration of the tranquillity, which it bestowed. The seventeenth year of this reign, or the year 1343, has been mentioned by Carte[7], as that in which he discovered the first clear distinction of the two houses of parliament. Three most important principles[8] also of the constitution were firmly established in the same reign; the illegality of raising money without the consent of the people, the necessity of the concurrence of the two houses of the parliament for any alteration of the law, and the right of the commons to enquire into public abuses, and to impeach the counsellors of the sovereign. These were most valuable landmarks of the public liberties, in erecting which fifty years of a reign of ability were usefully employed. The civil liberty too of individuals was secured in this reign, together with the political freedom of the government, since in it were first ascertained by a statute the cases of high treason[9].

[7] Parliamentary History, vol. i. p. 257. Mr. Hallam, however, thinks it inconsistent with probability, that the commons and lords were ever intermingled in voting, as the taxes were laid in different proportions on the three estates of the realm; and is of opinion that it may be inferred from the rolls of parliament, that the houses were divided, as they are at present, in the eighth, ninth, and nineteenth years of Edward II., and beyond doubt in the first of Edward III. —State of Europe during the Middle Ages. vol. ii. pp. 241—243. It may be remarked, that the force of both these observations is much weakened by the remark, which Mr. Hallam has added, that in the sixth of Edward III., though the knights and burgesses are expressly mentioned as consulting together, the former taxed themselves in a smaller rate of subsidy than the other, whence it appears that the difference of the rates of assessment does not imply separate discussion, while the mention of their consultation seems on the other hand to imply, that they were not then ordinarily united in one assembly. So far indeed was the parliament from being then regularly constituted, that there were three houses, the first composed of six prelates and six barons, the second of the other prelates and barons or their proxies, and the third of the knights, citizens, and burgesses.—Lingard, vol. iv. p. 24.

[8] Hallam, vol. ii. p. 249. [9] This statute has been since extended in

The military enterprises, in which this prince was continually engaged, imposed on him the necessity of soliciting frequent supplies from his people, and thus procured for the parliament, especially for the commons, a degree of importance, which could not otherwise have been attained. It has accordingly been observed[10], that he took care in every measure of moment to obtain the approbation of the parliament, that he might be enabled to require its support; and that it in this manner rose into higher consideration during his reign, and acquired a more regular authority, than in any former period, even the house of commons beginning to appear of some importance in the constitution.

It is doubtless true, as has been remarked by Hume[11], that many arbitrary acts were performed by Edward III.; but in forming a judgment of these acts it should be remembered, that the constitution was then but developing its principles, and all descriptions of persons were so accustomed to flagrant irregularities, that it was even found necessary to prevail with the nobility to promise[12], that they would not any longer afford protection to the disturbers of the public peace. For authorising us to pronounce a reign in such circumstances favourable to the cause of freedom, it is sufficient, that the numerous applications[13], which Edward had occasion to make to the parliament, contributed to increase and to ascertain its powers and privileges, as well as to arrange and establish the forms of its proceedings; and that numerous confirmations of the great charter, however they may serve to show that its provisions had been frequently violated, yet must have given additional validity to this venerable record of the national rights. Foreign enterprise, not domestic usurpation, was the object of his ambition; and to support the efforts, which he deemed necessary

two particulars: a conspiracy for levying war against the king has been declared to be equivalent to a conspiracy against his life; and it has been further determined to be treason, to attempt to overawe the parliament. The statute of Edward III. seems to have been occasioned by the corrupt conduct of the judges, who, to defraud the nobles of the escheats of lands forfeited to them by their vassals in certain cases of felony and misdemeanour, and to vest them in the crown, multiplied treasons, at their pleasure.—Carte's Hist. of England, vol. ii. p. 480. Lond. 1747—1755. [10] Hume, vol. ii. p. 514. [11] Ibid., p. 517. [12] Ibid., p. 522. [13] Millar's Hist. View of the Eng. Gov. vol. ii. p. 163.

to his glory, he was contented to avail himself of that organ of constitutional freedom, by which his purpose might best be facilitated, though he occasionally resorted to irregular expedients.

While the constitution was providing the important organ, by which the popular sentiment was to exercise its influence on the government, a revolution of religion was commencing, which, while it favoured the eternal interests of men, could best furnish the popular mind with the principles of political independence. Borne down by the overwhelming weight of ecclesiastical tyranny, the human intellect at length rose in England against the oppression; indignation prompted enquiry into the true nature and origin of abuses so galling and intolerable; and the reign of Edward III. gave a prelude to that reformation, which was a revolution in the policy, not less than in the religion of Europe.

John Wicliffe, born about the year 1324, began in the year 1360 to expose the corruptions of the clergy[14], and about twenty-one years afterwards made his appeal to the records of divine truth, by publishing the first English translation of the Bible[15]. From the honest and bold representations of this patriarch of the reformation, some knowledge of a purer religion was propagated, not only in England, but also on the continent of Europe. In England so late as in the year 1521, and therefore in the very age of the reformation, the disciples of Wicliffe[16] were still very

[14] Lewis's Life of Wicliffe, pp. 1, 8, 66. London, 1720

[15] There had been some Saxon versions, one of which, the work of Bede, comprehended the whole Bible. Several attempts also appear to have been made before the time of Wicliffe, to translate the scriptures into the English language; but these versions were limited to parts of the Bible, and seem to have been composed only for the private use of the translators. The translation of Wicliffe was a version of the Latin Bible then usually read, as he did not possess a sufficient knowledge of the Hebrew and Greek languages for deriving it immediately from the original. It was also a literal translation, like those of the Saxons, and therefore was not always intelligible to those, who did not understand the Latin language, from which it had been taken. It was afterwards revised by some of his followers, and rendered less verbal. The next English translation was that of Tindal, first published in the year 1526.—Bishop Newcome's Hist. View of the Engl. Bible. Transl., pp. 1—17. [16] Hume, vol. iv. p. 37. The historian has remarked that on this account the doctrines of Luther, then introduced into England,

numerous ; and his writings[17], carried to Bohemia after the death of the queen of Richard II.[18], by those, who, having been her attendants, then returned to their own country, marked out the way for John Huss and Jerome of Prague[19], who about fifteen years afterwards opposed themselves there to the usurpations of the Romish church.

In considering the great revolutions of history it is particularly interesting to notice the adaptation of circumstances, by which the chief agents are trained and excited to the functions, which they have to discharge. Gifted with superior talents for the acquisition of theological learning, and disciplined in the exercises of the university of Oxford, Wicliffe might notwithstanding have been but an eminent professor of divinity, if the encroachments of the mendicant friars[20], who interfered with the order of that seminary in

gained secretly many partisans among the laity of all ranks and denominations. [17] The following enumeration has been preserved of these treatises of Wicliffe, which were carried into Bohemia and burned there :—1. Dialogus ; 2. Trialogus ; 3. De Incarnatione Verbi Divini ; 4. De Corpore Christi ; 5. De Trinitate : 6. De Ideis ; 7. De Materia et Forma ; 8. De Hypotheticis ; 9. De Individuatione Temporis ; 10. De Probationibus Propositionum ; 11. De Universalibus ; 12. Super Evangelia Sermones per Circulum Anni ; 13. De Dominio Civili ; 14. Decalogus ; 15. De Simonia ; 16. De Attributis. Several of these are plainly of a scholastic, rather than a religious character ; but in that age they may have procured a more favourable reception for the others. The entire enumeration of his writings extends to more than three hundred articles.—Lewis, pp. 143, &c. [18] She was the sister of the emperor Wenceslaus, king of Bohemia, and died in the year 1394. [19] The Bohemians appear to have received their doctrine of the Lord's Supper, not from Wicliffe, but from the Waldenses, denying a corporal presence of our Saviour in that sacrament, and in this particular differing from Luther, who maintained such a presence, while he denied that the material elements of bread and wine are transformed into the body of Christ.—Seckendorf. lib. i. p. 276. Lipsiæ, 1694. Doctor Lingard has said (vol. iv. p. 264) of Wicliffe, 'if he frequently made use of orthodox language, he still more frequently taught a doctrine similar to the *impanation* of Luther.' For the former part of the assertion, which implies that he frequently taught the doctrine of transubstantiation, doctor L. has cited no authority. [20] The mendicant friars, who had been established in Oxford in the year 1230, laboured to exempt themselves from the regulation, which enjoined that no person should be permitted to become a doctor in divinity, who had not completed his education in that, or some other university. They were also excessively troublesome in drawing the youth of the university into their convents, so that parents were

the most vexatious manner, had not roused his academic feelings, and provoked him to expose the numerous abuses of those enemies of the society, of which he was a member. The distinction, which he had acquired in this controversy, having procured for him the successive appointments to the mastership of Baliol College and the wardenship of Canterbury Hall[21], he was by a new archbishop of Canterbury expelled from the latter situation, though he had been placed in it by the founder, and his expulsion was afterwards confirmed by the pope, to whom he had appealed. While Wicliffe was thus involved in a personal contention with the hierarchy, he found himself also engaged in a common cause with his sovereign Edward III., who thus became his patron and protector. The Roman pontiff, Urban V., probably induced by the diminution of the papal resources consequent on the residence of the popes at Avignon, demanded of that monarch the homage and the tribute stipulated with John[22]. The parliament, consulted by Edward, unanimously rejected the claim. A monk however having had the hardihood to maintain the pretensions of the pontiff in opposition to the parliament, Wicliffe, by publishing an argument in reply to this writer, connected himself with his sovereign in opposing the abuses of the ecclesiastical system, and was on this account noticed at the royal court, particularly by the duke of Lancaster, brother of the king. In the progress of the contention, which was thus begun between the papacy and the English government, two embassies were sent[23] to treat with the pontiff about the usurpations, by which he had encroached upon the ecclesiastical establishment of England[24], and Wicliffe, the champion of the royal

afraid of sending their children thither for education, and the number of students, which had been thirty thousand, was in the year 1357 reduced to six thousand.—Lewis, pp. 3, 4. Doctor Lingard (vol. iv. p. 213) speaks of Wicliffe's opposition to these men as a *ridiculous* contention.

[21] Of Wicliffe's appointment to the wardenship of Canterbury Hall doctor Lingard speaks (ibid. p. 214) as procured 'by means with which we are not acquainted;' but it is to be observed that it followed the appointment to the mastership of a college. [22] Ibid., p. 203.

[23] Lewis, pp. 28, &c. [24] The commons had in the year 1343 remonstrated in very strong terms against these encroachments, which they declared that they neither could, nor would any longer bear.—Parl. Hist., vol. i. p. 253. Wicliffe was sent in the year 1374; yet two years afterwards a bill was introduced into parliament, in which they

cause, was named in the latter deputation. Though the embassy did not reach Avignon, being met at Bruges by the papal deputies, the appointment afforded him some opportunity of taking a nearer view of the papal court, by which his dislike of the papacy was not at all mitigated. After his return he inveighed with so much asperity against the pontiff, that he even denominated him 'Antichrist, the proud worldly priest of Rome, and the most cursed of *clippers* and *pursekervers*.'

It may well be supposed that this early reformer did not in all particulars proceed as far as the leaders of the reformation in the sixteenth century. Even in the fourteenth however he could perceive the utter want of foundation for the spiritual, as well as for the temporal pretensions of the papal sovereignty[25]; he raised his warning voice against that triumph of blinded and blinding superstition, the monstrous doctrine of transubstantiation[26]; and, above all, he uttered the bold declaration, which is the principle of the religion of protestants, that the sacred scriptures alone are the authority of our belief. It has indeed been objected to his notions of

were represented as still subsisting. In this bill it was stated by the commons, that the sum received by the pope from England for ecclesiastical dignities was five times greater than the revenue of the king; that these were commonly bestowed upon foreigners, who never visited the country; and that the pope had possessed himself of the disposal of the headships of all the religious houses, which should be filled by elections, —Lewis, pp. 20, 31, 34. Men, who could talk in this manner, were, as Hume has remarked (vol. ii. p. 521), not far from reformation. How completely they were already weaned from clerical influence, appears, as he has observed (vol. iii. p. 56), from this remarkable fact, that in the committee of eighteen, to which Richard's last parliament delegated its power, not the name of one ecclesiastic can be found. From the list given in the Parliamentary History (vol. i. p. 492), it appears on the contrary, that the earl of Wiltshire was in this committee as the proctor of the clergy. Doctor Lingard has argued (vol. iv. p. 212) that the proceedings of the English parliament, in restraining these abuses of the papacy, prove beyond contradiction, 'that the distinction between the spiritual and temporal power of the pope, which is maintained by the catholics of the present day, was a principle fully recognised and asserted by their catholic ancestors many centuries ago.' They seem on the contrary only to prove, that the abuses of the spiritual power were then so great, as to have become insupportable.

[25] Lewis, p. 35.

[26] In opposition to this doctrine he maintained and published sixteen conclusions, the first of which is, that the "consecrated host, which we see upon the altar, is neither Christ, nor any part of him, but an effectual sign of him."—Ibid., p. 77.

religion, that he did not inculcate the righteousness which is by faith[27]; and it seems that he insisted rather on virtuous practice, than on the doctrine of our acceptance through the mediation of a Redeemer. But it is not surprising that, when ecclesiastical abuses, however great, had not reached the enormity of the sixteenth century, a reformer should not yet have been led to look to another principle of the divine acceptance, than the merit of human performances. Wicliffe was in truth the baptist of the reformation, who denounced the corruptions of the church, and pointed to the true source of religious instruction, but did not himself directly and explicitly communicate the doctrine.

In this manner was the precious seed of the reformation prepared in England, while on the continent, as has been already shown, a fit soil was provided for receiving it, and raising it in due time to its maturity. That the principle of this great revolution should have been deeply laid among the people of England, was suitable to the function afterwards discharged by the nation in the federative combinations of Europe, in which England was the support of the Protestants against the Roman-catholic governments. Germany on the other hand became the scene of the struggle of the separation, as the federative policy of Europe was but the development of the interior policy of the empire.

The brilliant successes of Edward III. in his invasions of France, and the heroic character and achievements of his son, the celebrated *black prince*, have chiefly attracted attention to this memorable reign[28]; and they well deserve con-

[27] This objection, with some others, was advanced by Melancthon in the following century. Inspexi et Uniglephum, qui valde tumultuatur in hac controversia, sed deprehendi in eo multa alia errata, ex quibus judicium de spiritu ejus fieri potest. *Prorsus nec intellexit, nec tenuit fidei justitiam.* Inepte confundit evangelium et politica, nec videt evangelium nobis concedere ut legitimis omnium gentium politiis utamur. Contendit presbyteris non licere ut possideant quidquam proprium. Decimas nullis vult solvi nisi docentibus, quasi evangelium vetet uti politicis ordinationibus. De dominio civili sophistice et plane seditiose rixatur. Ad eundem modum de cœna Domini sophistice cavillatur publice receptam sententiam.—Lewis, p. 113.

[28] Doctor Lingard has (vol. iv. p. 137) very justly remarked, that the massacre perpetrated at Limoges by the order of this prince, who by contemporary writers is pourtrayed as the model of chivalry, proves, among a thousand similar instances, how inadequate that system was

sideration for their remoter influences, though in their immediate effects they were as transient, as any other project of ambition, which has dazzled the imagination of a warrior.

It has been already remarked, that the military enterprises of this prince necessitated him to seek frequent supplies of money from his subjects. It may now be added, that by the popularity of his successes the people were disposed to comply with the requisitions of their sovereign, thus establishing an habitual dependence of the crown on the support of the parliament, and particularly attaching importance to the inferior and representative orders of the legislature. Very different was this operation of the French war from that, with which it acted on the government of France, where it ended in exalting the authority of the sovereign, by affording him the opportunity of acquiring the glory of recovering the ancient dominion of the crown. The same struggle appears to have acted upon each of the two contending nations in a manner suitable to the character of its internal policy, favouring in the one the development of a popular constitution, in the other the aggrandisement of the royal authority.

Of its operation on the external interests of England one part appears to have consisted in turning into a different course that national ardour, which must else have been employed in accomplishing the subjugation of the neighbouring kingdom of Scotland, and would thus have precluded all the results, which in a later period arose from the continued distinctness of the two governments. That Scotland had not been subdued by Edward II., must be ascribed to the weakness and misconduct of that prince[29], especially in not prosecuting the war with vigour in the first year of his reign. Notwithstanding the advantage given to the Scots by the imbecility of Edward II., his successor, in the ninth year of his reign, had driven them from all regular resistance, but just at that time[30] he was forced to relinquish this object, by the notoriety that the king of France, in his

to the moral regulation of mankind. 'The *black prince* spared the lives of the knights, who held Limoges against him, but shed with pleasure the meaner blood of the inhabitants, three thousand men, women, and children.' It was in truth a fantastic system of manners, accommodated to a temporary crisis of society. [29] Henry, vol. vii. p. 131. [30] Ibid., pp. 201, 202.

apprehension of the martial and ambitious spirit of the English monarch, had resolved to afford very powerful assistance to that party of the Scots, which still preserved its independence.

While the French war was thus instrumental in protecting by a military diversion the separate existence of Scotland, it served to give being to that spirit of animosity and rivalry, which has alienated the two nations of France and England, and seems to have been necessary for maintaining the opposite positions, in which they have been placed, as the two presiding states in the federative system of Europe. Before Edward III. invaded France, many causes[31] had operated to produce a very friendly intercourse between the two nations. The casual and temporary hostilities of their sovereigns had not been followed by any bloody or dangerous event, which could leave a lasting impression in the mind of either people; the English nobility and gentry were proud of their French or Norman extraction, and affected to use the language of France in all public transactions, and even in familiar conversation; and as the English court and camp were always full of nobles, who had come from some province or other of France, the two nations had been during several centuries more intermingled, than those of any two distinct countries mentioned in history. From this time however that amicable communication ceased, and the French and English began to act, as if they had been destined by nature to be enemies. Our humanity must lament, that such a spirit of alienation existed; but it seems to have been necessary to the relative condition of two nations, whose functions in the general system were so directly opposed: and if Hume has remarked that the animosity has existed principally on the part of the English, it should be remembered that the function of the English government, which consisted in restraining the ambition of a predominating rival, required a jealous vigilance of opposition. In the existing order of political relations the predominance of Russia seems to promise to these long rival nations the harmony belonging to a union of political interests.

One of the causes, which had previously maintained an

[31] Hume, vol. ii. p. 418.

amicable intercourse of the two nations, the prevalent use of the French language among the English, was removed by the increasing importance of the lower orders of the people, who had never relinquished their original dialect. In the thirty-sixth year of the reign of Edward III., the year 1362, it was enacted[32], agreeably to a petition of the commons, that all pleadings and judgments in the courts of Westminster should be expressed in the English, though enrolled in the Latin language; and it was also ordained that schoolmasters should teach their scholars to translate into the English, instead of the French language.

Though the French war appears to have been necessary both to the domestic and to the foreign concerns of the English government, it does not appear to have been expedient, that the acquisitions of Edward should be retained after his death. The two succeeding reigns were periods of agitation, in which foreign war could not with advantage have added to the dependence of the crown, nor was the nation sufficiently disengaged to threaten the independence of Scotland, while to the remaining operation of exciting a spirit of hostile rivalry between France and England, as well as to that of assisting the interior development of the French monarchy, the alternation of triumph and defeat was the most favourable arrangement of events. We accordingly find that, within three years before the conclusion of this reign, no more was preserved of all these possessions, than was just sufficient for securing to the English an entrance into France, when, as in the following reign of Henry V., they should be again in a situation, in which they might derive advantage from a struggle with their continental neighbours.

[32] Parl. Hist., vol. i. p. 292. The reason assigned in the petition was that the subject might understand the law, by which he holds what he hath, and is to understand what he doth. The next parliament was opened by an address in the English language.—Ibid., p. 294. In regard to the wars of Edward in France, doctor Lingard has taken occasion to observe (vol. iv. p. 80) that writers have not always sufficiently appreciated the benefits, which mankind derived from the pacific influence of the Roman pontiffs. It is true that in these wars the influence of the papacy was repeatedly exerted to restore peace between the contending sovereigns; but the pontiffs of this time were the pontiffs of the captivity, as their residence at Avignon was denominated, not the prelates of the imperial city.

The conclusion of this long and illustrious reign exhibited in a very remarkable manner the growth of parliamentary importance, which had been so much favoured by the military enterprises of the king; the effort indeed was then unavailing, but it prepared the way for the more decisive struggles, which afterwards drove his unworthy successor from the throne. In the latter years of the life of Edward III., a younger son, the duke of Lancaster, had acquired such an ascendency over him, that this prince even incurred the suspicion of meditating to set aside the heir of the crown, when his father, the *black prince*, should have sunk into that grave, which seemed ready to receive him; and the king was at the same time yet more dishonoured by the shameful influence, which Alice Pierce, or Perrers, had gained over his declining age, and abused in the most scandalous manner, not only causing him to squander the public money in ostentatious expenses, but also interposing for interested purposes even in the ordinary administration of justice. The *black prince*[33], jealous of the duke of Lancaster, took a decisive part in the proceedings of an opposition-party in the parliament, and this party was led in the house of commons by Peter de la Mare, a servant of the earl of March, who, by his marriage with the heiress of a second son of the king, stood before the duke of Lancaster in his pretension to the throne. Thus encouraged and assisted, the parliament proceeded, not only to require that the council should be strengthened by the addition of ten or twelve persons, whose consent should be necessary in the transaction of the public business, but also to impeach certain officers, one of whom was the creature and friend of the duke of Lancaster, and to restrain the interference of Alice Pierce in the administration of justice, under the penalties of forfeiture and banishment. The prince of Wales however died soon after the dissolution of the parliament; the favourites recovered their influence, and Peter de la Mare was thrown into prison; and a parliament, assembled in the following year, restored those who had been impeached, and repealed the ordinance issued against Alice Pierce.

It has been well observed[34] that the policy adopted by

[33] Hallam's State of Europe during the Middle Ages, vol. ii. pp. 260, &c. [34] Ibid., pp. 262, 263.

the prince of Wales and the earl of March, in exciting a parliamentary opposition, instead of encountering their adversaries by violence, indicates a considerable improvement in the constitution of the government. It has also been justly remarked, that this exertion of aristocratical influence, while it gave a powerful impulse to the efforts of the commons, and particularly tended to establish their right of control over public abuses, served also to establish between them and the nobles a relation of harmony, which could not generally be expected to subsist between the two orders. The balance of our constitution is obvious, and has been commonly noticed; but men have rarely remarked the combinations, by which its parts, though opposed, are yet connected, and united in one common interest.

The crisis formed by the death of Edward III. was especially favourable to the importance of the parliament, the heir of the crown being but ten years old, and the deceased king, though he had taken care to secure the succession of his grandson, not having established any plan of government for a minority. The commons on this occasion stood forward, though they contented themselves with praying[35], that the lords would appoint a council of regency, and choose guardians and tutors for the young prince. In this parliament indeed a large proportion of the knights[36], who had sat in that which impeached the Lancastrian party, was again returned; and Peter de la Mare, now released from prison, was chosen to preside over the representative part of the legislature, and to express its sentiments with the freedom, by which he had been already distinguished.

Though the commons did not at first claim any immediate share in the regulation of the government, but contented themselves with petitioning that the lords would form the necessary determinations, they ventured in the same parliament to assert other pretensions. They prayed that those might be removed from the royal council, who had been ministers of the late king[37]; that the officers of the king's court should be restrained from maintaining by their influence suits and contentions; that the principal of these officers should during the minority of the king be elected in the

[35] Parl. Hist., vol. i. p. 340. [36] Hallam's State of Europe during the Middle Ages, vol. ii. p. 263. [37] Parl. Hist., vol. i. p. 342.

parliament; and that a parliament should be assembled once in every year specially for the administration of justice. In proposing that the great officers should be chosen in the parliament, the commons seem to have designed, that the selection should not be committed wholly to the lords; these however assumed the right of choosing them, and the commons acquiesced. The subsidy, voted in this parliament for the prosecution of the war with France, was committed specially to the care of two citizens of London, who were sworn in the parliament to the faithful execution of the trust.

The administration during the minority was kept together by the secret authority of the king's uncles, especially of the duke of Lancaster. A remarkable combination of circumstances at the same time assisted in preserving the public tranquillity, in a crisis so favourable to the growing power of the commons. The habits of obedience[38], which the barons had contracted during the long and vigorous reign of Edward III., continued to influence their conduct; the ambition of the king's three uncles was restrained by the affectionate regard, which the people entertained for the memory of the *black prince*, the father of the king, and by a consideration of the opposition, which each might expect to receive from the two others; and the age and experience of the duke of Lancaster, together with the authority which he had enjoyed under the late king, gave to this nobleman such an ascendency over his brothers, as enabled him to act with the power, though without the title of regent.

During nine of the ten years, which the minority comprehended, the government was administered by the council, thus directed and controlled; but the king then broke from the restraint, in which he had been held, and attaching himself to an unworthy favourite, Robert de Vere earl of Oxford, gave occasion to the troubles, which were at length terminated in his deposition and death. During the preceding period of tranquil, but not vigorous administration, the popular part of the legislature enjoyed an opportunity of gradually acquiring new authority in the government; in the subsequent period of public disorder, its powers, thus quietly augmented, found an ample occasion of exertion

[38] Hume, vol. iii. p. 2.

with decisive effect. The entire reign therefore, which comprehended twenty-two years, may be considered as consisting of two distinct parts, the one of which permitted the undisturbed growth of the representative order of the parliament, and the other afforded a season of difficulty, in which it might best make trial of its strength.

The commons, who in the first parliament of the reign of Richard exhibited so many indications of an independent spirit, displayed in the course of his minority other proofs of their increasing importance in the constitution. In the second year of this reign[39] they requested, that an account should be laid before them of the expenditure of the subsidy of the preceding, which was granted, though with a vain protestation against the precedent: in the fifth they presented a remonstrance about the abuses of the king's government, and also about the violences of the nobles, who united in confederacies for their mutual support: and in the ninth they manifested, in a very remarkable instance, an enlightened jealousy of the crown, resolving that a subsidy should cease during a short interval, lest it might be claimed as a right.

Though a considerable degree of tranquillity was maintained among the higher orders of society during the minority, yet was the public peace, in the year 1381, disturbed by an insurrection of the populace, distinguished by the assumed appellation of one of its leaders, Wat Tyler. The insurrection[40] was chiefly the result of the effervescence, excited in various states of Europe by those principles of general improvement, which in the fourteenth century had begun to act with somewhat augmented power. Having had its beginning in Flanders, it had twenty-three years before given being to the *jacquerie* of France. It may therefore be considered as an effect of a general cause acting about the same time in different countries, and little, if at all connected, with the religious movement of Wicliffe and his followers, as doctor Lingard is willing to believe[41].

[39] Parl. Hist., vol. i. p. 352. [40] Hume, vol. iii. p. 7.

[41] Hist. of England, vol. iv. p. 236. Mr. Turner has on the other hand inferred, that two bodies of the insurgents, ten thousand in number, who went through the kingdom in search of the duke of Lancaster, and destroyed all his property at Leicester, and his castle at Tuttebury,

The insurgents of France[42] have been described to us as a ferocious rabble, goaded into rebellion in the general anarchy of the state by the unrestrained violences of the upper orders of society, and seeking the revenge of their intolerable sufferings in such more than brutal cruelties, as united against them the nobles of all the three parties, by which the country was distracted, the French, the English, and those of Navarre, and brought down upon them a sudden ruin. The insurgents of England were also driven to resistance[43] by the oppressions of the upper orders, but these were such as had been sanctioned by partial laws, not the violences of a lawless nobility, availing themselves of the suspension of all regular government; and the mutineers, instead of seeking their satisfaction in the indiscriminate massacre of their superiors, committed indeed numerous violences, but however proposed various regulations, by which they conceived that their interest would be effectually secured, nor were these regulations in truth liable to any other objection, than that the nation was not yet prepared to receive them. The abolition of slavery[44], the freedom of commerce in market-towns, and a commutation of the services of villenage into a fixed rent of lands, were the equitable, though not yet practicable demands, of the English populace. Charters of manumission of slaves and amnesty of offences[45] were granted by Richard to two considerable bodies of the insurgents, which presently dispersed, and the other when their leader had been killed for his insolence, was conciliated by the prompt address of the young king, in offering to take his place at their head. The charters indeed were soon re-

were instigated and directed by the adversaries of Wicliffe, whom the duke had protected.—Ibid., vol. ii. p. 203. Rapin has remarked that Wicliffe, then residing in his parish, was never questioned about the insurrection, and that the only colour for the accusation was that one of the leaders, John Ball, had been a little before thrown into prison for preaching the new doctrine.—Vol. i. p. 459.

[42] Abrégé Chron., tome iv. pp. 120, 121.

[43] Hume, vol. iii. pp. 8, &c.

[44] Personal slavery was at this time more general, in England, than in any other country of Europe.—Froissart, liv. ii. ch. lxxiv. The successive invasions of the Saxons, the Danes, and the Normans, with the wars of the Saxon kingdoms, may sufficiently explain the existence of so much civil degradation. As none are more tenacious of their own liberty than those who are masters of the liberty of others, the prevalence of slavery may have favoured the formation of a free constitution.

[45] Rapin, vol. i. pp. 457, 458.

voked by the king, and the enfranchisement was afterwards rejected by the parliament, though the king expressed a disposition favourable to the measure.

It may be believed that, though the populace were again subjected to their former grievances, their resistance had not been destitute of efficacy in meliorating their condition, as it must have taught the upper orders the possibility of their union, and the danger of their discontent. We know at least that a salutary effect of this kind was produced, in regard to that particular grievance, which had been the immediate occasion of the insurrection. The lower orders had been roused to resistance by the imposition of a poll-tax[46], which, though in some small degree modified in relation to the wealth of different classes of the people, was still to the poor exceedingly burthensome and oppressive; and the result of their resistance was that this iniquitous mode of assessment was for that time abandoned. A tax is a contribution of property, and to exact it from persons, instead of property, was in truth to oppress the poor for the relief of the rich. The modifications, by which it was moderated, acknowledged the unfairness of the principle, since the tax was, so far as they operated, converted from a personal assessment into a property-tax.

In the ninth year of his reign Richard became impatient of the restraint, in which he had been held by his uncles[47], and, breaking from it, devoted himself to the earl of Oxford his favourite. The princes of the royal family and the chief nobility immediately united all their power in opposing the new administration; and, the duke of Gloucester being popular in the house of commons, that house was induced to commence an impeachment of the chancellor, the earl of Suffolk.

[46] Such a tax had been enacted two years before, but the produce had been found deficient. This had been very minutely graduated, from six pounds thirteen shillings and four-pence down to four-pence. To supply the deficiency another poll-tax was imposed at the close of the following year, three groats being required for every male and female fifteen years old, to be so apportioned in cities and towns, that no individual should pay less than one groat, or more than sixty for himself and his wife.—Lingard, vol. iv. pp. 231—235. Five other instances of a poll-tax, variously modified or restricted, occur in the history of England, the last of them at the Restoration.—Parl. Hist., vol. ii. pp. 201, 250; vol. iii. p. 14; vol. ix. p. 416; vol. xxii. pp. 302, 460.

[47] Hume, vol. iii. pp. 14—16.

Though the principle of impeachment was not absolutely new, this was the first instance of the impeachment of a minister[48], lord Latimer, who was the object of such a prosecution towards the close of the preceding reign, having been only steward of the royal household. The king, having first vainly attempted to suppress the impeachment by withdrawing from his parliament, contented himself with stipulating that no other of his ministers should be attacked. The chancellor was accordingly dismissed from his office, and the impeachment was suffered to proceed. The result however was not tragical, for the earl, who had been committed to prison, was discharged by the king soon after the parliament had been dismissed.

It has been alleged by Hume[49], that the charges urged against the earl of Suffolk were of the most frivolous nature, as the proofs of them were most defective. But he has omitted to notice the second article[50], charging him with neglecting to enforce an ordinance, which had been approved for the better regulation of the government, and the third, distinctly accusing him of the misapplication of the money produced by a tax, which had been imposed specifically for the purpose of guarding the sea. Of the evidence, by which the charges were supported, Walsingham[51] has stated, that they were so fully proved, that the king shook his head, and said, Alas Michael! see what thou hast done!

Though the commons did not impeach any other minister, they did not consider the prosecution of the earl of Suffolk as a sufficient remedy of the abuses of the government, but proceeded to appoint, in conjunction with the other house of parliament[52], a council of eleven lords, to regulate with the three chief officers of the crown the affairs of the kingdom for a year. By this measure, says Hume[53], the king was in truth dethroned, and it must be admitted that his power was suspended during the existence of such a commission. But the fair consideration of this proceeding seems to be, not that it was a usurpation, which the opposition-party designed to perpetuate, but rather that it was an irre-

[48] Parl. Hist., vol. i. pp. 301, 302. [49] Vol. iii. p. 17. [50] Parl. Hist., vol. i. p. 397. [51] Ibid., pp. 399, 400. [52] In the beginning of this reign the commons had contented themselves with praying the lords to appoint a council for the king. [53] Vol. iii. p. 18.

gular effort of reformation, unavoidable in a government, in which the several parts of the constitution had not yet been adjusted, and a violence of movement resulted necessarily from their reciprocal counteractions. How great were the abuses, which provoked it, has been strongly stated by Knighton[54], who alleges that, by the corrupt conduct of the officers of the crown, the public revenue was wasted, the king defrauded, and the people oppressed. And since four years before, as has been stated by Walsingham[55], the king with his privy council had arrogated and exercised a power of altering, or annulling, the regulations ordained by the parliament, an extraordinary interposition of the legislature had become indispensable to the safety of the government. The measure adopted was indeed violent and dangerous, because the principles of the constitution had not yet been distinctly developed; but its violence served to excite a reaction of the sovereign, which had the effect of giving occasion to the establishment of a precedent of liberty, to be followed with less irregularity and violence in an age of more improved policy.

The history of Hume, it must be observed, has in no part of the narrative so remarkably violated the first duty of a historian, as in the account of the reign of Richard II., obviously because the revolution, by which it was terminated, bore a considerable resemblance, as he has himself noticed, to that later revolution, which removed from the throne of these countries the family of the Stuarts. The partiality, which biassed his narration, has in this part even impelled him in a direction opposite to that, which he has generally taken in describing the conduct and characters of the earlier princes of England. Though he has shown himself desirous of exaggerating the arbitrary measures of others of these princes, that he might extenuate those of the Stuarts, yet has he represented this prince[56], as conducting himself during a period of eight years from the termination of his minority, or during nearly the whole of his actual exercise of the royal power, with much moderation. For illustrating the misrepresentation of the historian it will be sufficient to observe[57] that, while he has mentioned an act of parlia-

[54] Parl. Hist., vol. i. p. 400. [55] Ibid., p. 393. [56] Vol. iii. p. 26.
[57] Ibid., pp. 37, 38.

ment, by which authority was given to a committee of both houses to finish all business not previously concluded, and has inferred from a similar proceeding in the beginning of the reign of Henry VI., that it was the uninfluenced act of the legislature, he has omitted a passage contained in the narrative of Walsingham, one of his own authorities[58], which mentions that the persons so commissioned proceeded to treat of other matters belonging to the parliament, besides those which had been specially referred to them, and that the king caused the records of the parliament to be altered, for the purpose of justifying their conduct.

When Richard was dissolving the parliament, which, after the impeachment of the chancellor, had transferred for a year to a select council the whole authority of the crown[59], he made a public protestation, that no proceeding of that parliament should prejudice his prerogative. In the following year he held at Nottingham a council of his favourites, which convened the sheriffs of the neighbouring counties, and demanded of them what forces they could raise for the support of the king. The sheriffs having given no encouragement to the scheme of providing an armed force, for maintaining the cause of the king against his people, a second expedient of a pacific character was devised, and these officers were required to take care, that no knights or burgesses should be returned to the next parliament, except such as should have been nominated by the king, and his council. This other proposal having been also resisted, as one which the spirit of the people would not tolerate, the last and desperate measure was adopted, of procuring from the judges opinions, which should condemn the measures of the opposition. The answers of the judges[60] were agreeable to the utmost wishes of the court, pronouncing every act to be treasonable[61], about which they had been consulted, even the impeachment of a minister, unless sanctioned by the royal permission.

The nation did not submit to these efforts of arbitrary government. An armed force[62] was assembled under the

[58] Hist., p. 394. Lond., 1574. [59] Parl. Hist., vol. i. pp. 405, 406. [60] Ibid., p. 407. [61] This was a direct violation of the statute of Edward III., which had provided, that no other than the specified acts should be considered as treasonable, unless they should have been so declared by the parliament. [62] Parl. Hist., vol. i. p. 410.

duke of Gloucester, who marched towards London. The king then found it necessary to yield so far, as to agree that all grievances should be referred to the determination of the next parliament. That parliament, notwithstanding a futile attempt to model the elections[63], evinced its independence by impeaching the ministers and the judges, charging the former in particular[64] with having caused the king to seek assistance from France, and to promise, as the price of that assistance, the surrender of Calais, Brest, Cherburgh, and other possessions in that country; nor did this assembly, named by some historians the *wonder-working*, by others the *merciless* parliament, separate, until almost all the accused were either executed, or driven into banishment. In the imperfect state of the constitution[65] it was deemed necessary to save the honour of the king by a specific resolution of the lords, purporting that, in consideration of his tender age, and the innocency of his royal person, no fault should be imputed to him individually. The responsibility of ministers being but at this time established, the general security of the royal person had not yet become an acknowledged principle of the constitution.

About two years after the dissolution of the parliament, which had thus wreaked its vengeance on the instruments of the royal power, Richard declared himself of full age, and immediately dismissed the persons placed about him by the parliament, choosing for himself a new set of ministers. One of the new ministers, William of Wickham, bishop of Winchester, who had been appointed chancellor[66], introduced so much moderation into the government, that during two years and a half a very remarkable degree of harmony subsisted between the king and the parliament. Though soon after this wise minister had been displaced, the king proceeded to the extremity of seizing the liberties of his capital, and of imposing on the citizens a penalty of ten

[63] In the writs issued for electing members for this parliament, a clause was inserted, ordering the sheriffs 'to return those persons that 'were the most indifferent in the present disputes.' This was discovered, and the king was obliged to renew the writs, and even to specify, that the obnoxious clause had been inserted contrary to the ancient form.—Parl. Hist., vol. i. p. 411. [64] Ibid., pp. 423, 424.
[65] Ibid., p. 432. [66] Ibid., vol. i. p. 449.

thousand pounds, for some offence with which he charged them, still the parliament proved obsequious[67], and even recalled the judges, who had been banished into Ireland in consequence of the impeachment of the commons. In the year 1397, six years after the removal of the chancellor[68], a feeble attempt at remonstrance was made by the lower house, particularly concerning the extravagant expenses of the royal household; but the offence was quickly expiated by a most humiliating submission, in which the liberties of the parliament were so entirely forgotten, that the individual, who had proposed the obnoxious measure, was brought to trial for it before the parliament, and condemned to die as a traitor, though his life was spared at the intercession of the bishops, because he happened to be an ecclesiastic.

The short interval of good administration seems to have been connected with the misgovernment which followed, as accustoming the parliament to submission. Its continued obsequiousness[69] was probably the result of the weakness of the commons, not then supported by any powerful confederacy of the nobles, who had been subjugated by the king, perhaps through their own disunion. The whole appears to have formed an apt introduction to the plan of managing the parliament by influencing the elections.

A second parliament assembled in the year 1397 has been recorded as the first[70], which had been thus corruptly modelled. In correspondence to its base formation it has rendered itself infamous by its servility. The duke of Gloucester and two other noblemen were impeached and convicted as traitors, for the resistance which they had opposed to Richard nine years before, and for having introduced the impeachment of the ministers of the crown and the judges, though the former proceeding had been pardoned in the parliament, and the latter had been sanctioned by its concurrence; and in the following year the slavish answers of the judges[71], which had surrendered to the king the liberties of the people were adopted in a second session of the same parliament, as the genuine doctrines of the constitution. The same parliament, which had thus consummated the triumph

[67] Parl. Hist., p. 454. [68] Ibid., pp. 456—458. [69] Hallam's State of Europe during the Middle Ages, vol. ii. pp. 279. 281, 285.
[70] Rapin, vol. i. p. 468. [71] Parl. Hist., vol. i., p. 483.

of the king over the liberties of the people, concluded by adopting two measures, which sealed its own degradation. On the last day of the second session[72], when a larger present supply was voted, than had ever been given to the preceding sovereign, the subsidy of wool, leather, and woolfells, was settled on the king for his life, with a vain protest indeed against the operation of the precedent in any future reign; and the whole power of the parliament was then delegated to a committee composed of twelve lords and six commoners[73], which was authorised to despatch all matters left unfinished, together with others depending on them.

This last measure, which devolved upon the king and a small junta the whole authority of the legislature, was precisely that which hurried the king to his destruction, and overthrew the system of arbitrary power then so successfully erected. The gross abuses, which arose from the delegation of the authority of the parliament, have been wholly omitted by Hume, but have been strongly stated by Rapin[74]. While the foreign interests of the kingdom were wholly neglected, the ministry sought to augment the revenue by new taxes[75], forced loans, and even acts of direct extortion: and at length seventeen counties were, in consequence of the prosecutions, at this time instituted, confiscated to the use of the king.

These excesses outraged and alienated the people. The oppression practised upon one distinguished individual provided them with the leader, who crushed the oppressor. The duke of Hereford[76], son of the duke of Lancaster, having accused the duke of Norfolk of having slandered the king, by imputing to him a resolution of destroying certain lords, among whom was the duke of Hereford himself, notwithstanding that they had been received into the royal favour, it was determined by the king and the committee of the parliament, that the accusation should be judged by combat. The duel was afterwards superseded by the same authority, and both dukes were sent into banishment, the duke of

[72] Parl., Hist., vol. i. p. 486. [73] Ibid., p. 492. [74] Vol. i. p. 470. [75] Hume has particularly commended Richard for not having levied any tax without the consent of parliament.—Vol. iii. p. 46. As his policy consisted in so modelling the parliament, as to render it the instrument of his extortions, little is gained by the vindication.

[76] Parl. Hist., vol. i. pp. 489, &c.

Hereford for six years, and the duke of Norfolk for his life. In the following year the duke of Lancaster died, and his estates should have descended to his son; but, though the duke of Hereford had previously procured from the king a patent authorising him to sue by his attorney for any lands, which might descend to him, and to postpone his homage, until his return, his claim to the great estates of his father was disregarded, and the lands were seized for the crown. The young duke of Lancaster, more irritated by this spoliation, than by his banishment, became from that time the object of the discontented. These resorted to him in his exile, beseeching him to endeavour to redress their grievances, together with his own; and he at length determined to try his fortune in England, as soon as a favourable opportunity should occur. Such an opportunity was speedily furnished by the imprudence, with which the king went himself into Ireland to repress an insurrection. Richard returned indeed when he had received intelligence of the enterprise of the duke of Lancaster, but after the lapse of many weeks, occasioned chiefly by an extraordinary continuance of easterly winds[77]: and his rival had in that interval so completely secured his success, that no expedient remained for him, except to offer a resignation of the government.

Though Richard had abdicated his authority, it was deemed prudent that he should be formally deposed, and, to justify the measure, thirty-three articles of accusation were alleged against him. Of these Hume[78] has asserted that, except some rash speeches, the reality of which might well be questioned, the chief amount of the charge is limited to the violences of the last two years, and that these were partly supported by the authority of the parliament, partly justified by the conduct of his predecessors. This is a very light method of disposing of so grave, and so detailed an accusation. The last two years of his reign differed from the former only as his principles of misgovernment were then matured, and his tyrannical disposition exempted from restraint. That his acts of tyranny were sanctioned by a parliament which he had corrupted in its very formation, was an aggravation, not an extenuation of his guilt. The final issue

[77] Rapin, vol. i. p. 471. [78] Vol. iii. pp. 44—46.

of this scheme of tyranny however taught the commons, by the actual exercise of the most solemn function of a parliament, to respect themselves as the depositaries of the interests and the independence of their constituents.

But, whatever increase the importance, and the power of the parliament may thus have received, much still remained to be done for completing the adjustment of the English government. The king still retained many arbitrary powers, which might be restrained in an age of greater improvement, though as Hume[79] has justly remarked, if the king had possessed no arbitrary powers, while all the nobles assumed and exercised them, there must have been an absolute anarchy in the state. That the system of feudal oppression had lost much of its consistency, is proved by the voluntary confederacies formed under powerful leaders for mutual defence[80]. Still however enough of it remained, to require for some time to be restrained by the sovereign with powers, which the constitution in its more perfect state would neither demand, nor admit.

CHAPTER VII.

Of the history of England, from the beginning of the reign of Henry IV. in the year 1399, *to that of the reign of Henry VIII. in the year* 1509.

House of Lancaster. Henry IV. king in the year 1399—Henry V. king, 1413—Treaty of Troyes, 1420—Henry VI. king, 1422—War of the two houses begun, 1452—War with France ended, 1457.—*House of York*—Edward IV. king, 1461—War of the two houses ended, 1471—Edward V. king, and Richard III. king, 1483.—*House of Tudor* Henry VII. king, 1485.

THE present chapter will review a busy and eventful period of seven reigns, distinguished by the parliamentary establishment of a new dynasty, by the struggle of the rival families of Lancaster and York, by the union of their pretensions in the family of Tudor, by the depression of the aristocracy and the exaltation of the royal power, and by

[79] Vol. iii. p. 61. [80] Ibid., p. 63.

the brilliant, but temporary success, with which the English triumphed over their continental neighbours.

Of the seven reigns proposed to be reviewed, three, namely those of Henry fourth, fifth, and sixth, belong to that branch of the royal family, which has been denominated the house of Lancaster, the first of these princes having been son of a duke of Lancaster, who was the [1] third son of Edward III.; the three next succeeding, namely those of Edward the fourth and fifth, and of Richard III., belong to that other branch, which has been denominated the house of York, these princes having descended from a duke of York, who was the fourth son of the same monarch; and the last, or that of Henry VII., gave beginning to a new series, which has been called the house of Tudor, this prince having been the son of a Welsh gentleman of that name, though by his mother descended from the House of Lancaster. The claims of the two rival houses were united when Henry VII. married Elizabeth daughter of Edward IV.

The claim of Henry IV., though preferable to that of the family of York, could itself be maintained only by the authority of the parliament, the true heir of the throne being the young earl of March, descended from the second son of Edward III. As the earl of March[2] was, at the time of the deposition of Richard II., but seven years old, his title was not much regarded, and had only the effect of throwing on the support of the parliament the first of the Lancastrian princes. The right of the Lancastrian branch was not contested by that of York, until the long minority and the continued imbecility of Henry VI. presented an opportunity which encouraged its ambition; and it is to be observed that at this time[3] the house of York had acquired a preferable right of descent through the female line from the second son of Edward III., which had just then become more available by the extinction of the male line of that branch. At that time however a possession continued through more than the half of a century, and through three

[1] The third of those who attained maturity. By some writers he is denominated the fourth, and Lionel duke of Clarence the third.

[2] Hume, vol. iii. p. 67. [3] Richard earl of Cambridge, grandfather of Edward IV., had married Anne, sister of the earl of March. The death of the earl afterwards transferred his pretension to his sister.

successive reigns, had invested the Lancastrian family with a right of prescription, which assisted in balancing the hereditary pretension so acquired.

Henry IV. was not willing to be considered an elected sovereign, though he found it necessary to procure the sanction of the parliament for his elevation. He accordingly qualified his application by insinuating, that he had already acquired the crown by arms, a pretension however on which he could not place much reliance, as he had landed from France attended by only sixty persons[4]. In addition to the claim of conquest he alleged an unfounded pretension[5] of a descent from Henry III., and he also produced the signet of the deposed monarch as a proof of a cession of the crown. He sought support after his elevation by gratifying the clergy, having procured with this view the first statute for inflicting on heretics the cruel punishment of fire. In the year 1383[6] an ordinance for the apprehension of heretics had been by the clergy surreptitiously introduced into the statute-book, which still remains there, though it had never been sanctioned by the consent of the commons, and was on that account formally repealed in the ensuing year. But the situation of Henry IV. was favourable to the wishes of the clergy, and accordingly in the second year of his reign an act was procured, which authorised, not only their apprehension, but their destruction.

The violent policy, by which this prince conciliated the clergy, though immediately opposed, was not, in the issue, unfavourable to the cause of religious reformation. The doctrine of Wicliffe had already enjoyed an ample opportunity of attracting the attention of the English public, so that the half of the nation[7] was supposed to have been proselyted; and this success was quite sufficient for insuring, that it should continue to be cherished by a large number of persons, and transmitted to an age better qualified for effecting a separation from the church of Rome. Though a most useful harbinger of this great revolution, Wicliffe was not

[4] Parl. Hist., vol. i. p. 499, note *n*. [5] He was by his mother descended from Edmund, the second son of Henry III., who it was pretended had been really elder than Edward I., but postponed in the succession on account of his deformity. [6] Parl. Hist., vol. i. p. 372.
[7] Lewis, p. 175.

fitted to be the immediate leader of the change, his notions of pure religion being, as Melancthon observed, imperfect, and blended with others of a political nature[8], from which they should have been kept distinct. It was therefore expedient that this early tendency towards a reformation of religion should not be freely indulged, but experience such a resistance from the government, as might be sufficient to prevent a premature attempt. Neither had the time yet arrived, when such an attempt might be accommodated to the political interests of the country, though its actual circumstances were sufficiently favourable to the first promulgation of the principles of reformation. The military enterprises, which engrossed the attention of Edward III., afforded an opportunity for publishing these principles, which could not have existed under the crafty policy of the Lancastrian princes, or amidst the contention of the two rival houses, or when the commons had sunk under the ascendency of Henry VII.; and on the other hand neither could the great struggle of the English reformation have usefully mixed itself with the political interests of the government, until the family of the Stuarts had been placed upon the throne, so that it might become instrumental to the important revolution, by which that family was removed. The doctrine of Wicliffe was thus introduced at a favourable time to the knowledge of the people of England, and then, discouraged by the government, made its way silently among the lower orders, until the circumstances, in which Henry VIII. found himself placed, disposed him to reject the supremacy of Rome, and to give a beginning to a reformed church, which was completed under Edward VI. and Elizabeth.

The difficulties, in which Henry IV. was involved, were numerous and perplexing. Richard, whom he had caused to be deposed, was the son of that *black prince*, whose me-

[8] Wicliffe always taught the duty of obeying princes.—Lewis, p. 116. This indeed might be presumed, as he had begun his career by supporting the royal authority against the usurpations of the papacy. It is however admitted by his biographer, and proved from his writings, that he followed Augustine in maintaining that 'no one in mortal sin 'hath a true dominion over any of the creatures in the sight of God, 'but deserves to be called a tyrant, a thief, and a robber, although 'by reason of some human law he retain the name of a king, a princ 'or a lord.'—Ibid.

mory was cherished as the glory of the English nation, and, notwithstanding all his errors, had numerous friends among his former subjects. His death indeed followed his deposition within a few months, the natural consequence of an unsuccessful attempt to restore him to his throne; but, as he died secretly in prison, he was still believed to be alive, and his re-establishment was the object of successive conspiracies. The earl of March too remained, the nearest heir of the throne, and whose father had some years before been acknowledged in this character by the parliament. The very instruments of the advancement of Henry, particularly the two powerful earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland, greatly multiplied the embarrassment of his situation, on account of the difficulty of recompensing services so important. From the hostility of the king of France however, whose daughter Richard had married, he was happily protected[9] by the violent contention between the two families of Burgundy and Orleans, about the administration of the French government, which had been begun two years before his advancement to the throne of England.

In these difficult circumstances all the address of this prince was merely sufficient for maintaining him in the possession of the royal dignity, nine of the fourteen years of his reign being employed in combating the efforts of his adversaries. He was therefore never able to assume an independence of that parliamentary authority, to which he was indebted for his elevation, the declining state of his health, in the latter and more tranquil part of his reign, having disqualified him for such exertions to extend his prerogative, as might otherwise have been made by a prince, who had been successful in crushing so many insurrections.

Such a reign was necessarily favourable to the authority of the parliament, and to the growing importance of the house of commons, Not only did the parliament[10], which had placed Henry IV. on the throne, revise and repeal those acts, which in the preceding reign had given an extraordinary extension to the regal power, but through the whole of his reign we find the legislature jealous of the public rights, and the house of commons[11] asserting new powers, or main

[9] Henault, vol. i. p. 279. [10] Rapin, vol. i. pp. 485, 486.
[11] Hume, vol. iii. p. 83.

taining as established privileges such as had been rarely exercised. The ninth year of this reign in particular was distinguished by a declaration of the house of commons[12], protesting against disclosing to the king any matter depending in parliament.

The first of the Lancastrian princes was always apprehensive of the claim of the earl of March, whom accordingly he held in confinement; and, though the generosity of Henry V.[13] was so successful in conciliating that nobleman, that he gave no disturbance to the government, yet the king never could forget, that the title of his family was liable to be contested. The beneficial influence of this situation of the reigning family has been strongly stated by Hume. Conscious of the embarrassment of the title, by which they held the royal power, the princes of the house of Lancaster, he remarks[14], never ventured to impose taxes without the consent of the parliament. The rule, he adds, was then established, and could not afterwards be safely disregarded even by princes of more confirmed authority. We may well appreciate as an occurrence of great political benefit, the irregular introduction of a new series of sovereigns, which proved to be the occasion of practically confirming a principle, on which rests the constitutional importance of a parliamentary legislature.

Henry IV. indeed, about the middle of his reign[15], did endeavour to prevail separately with the lords and the clergy to grant him a supply, being ashamed to solicit the parliament, which had recently voted one of a considerable amount; but he failed in both applications, the lords and the clergy declaring, that they could not comply, unless sanctioned by the authority of the parliament. He also afterwards[16] endeavoured to control the returns of the members of the house of commons; but he was in the following session constrained to give his consent to a bill, by which a fine of one hundred pounds was imposed upon any sheriff, who should be guilty of falsifying a return. The king in the same year[17], having

[12] Parl. Hist., vol. i. p. 109. [13] Hume, vol. iii. p. 125.
[14] Ibid., p. 130. [15] Rapin, vol. i. p. 496. [16] Ibid., p. 500.
[17] To this resistance the commons, according to the Parliamentary History, vol. ii. pp. 115—117, were prompted by religious zeal and by resentment. Having, it is stated, very generally embraced the opinions

required a power of levying annually a certain subsidy, though the parliament should not be assembled, experienced a decisive refusal; and this body was afterwards careful to state, that those supplies, which they continued from year to year, were granted of their own good will, and not of duty. It has indeed been remarked generally by Hume[18] of the house of commons in this reign, that, whenever they had been brought to make an unwary concession to the crown, they also showed their freedom by a very speedy retractation. He has illustrated the remark by the instance, in which that body prevailed with Henry to alter his first settlement of the crown in his family, by which it had been entailed on the heirs male, into one acknowledging the claims of the princesses of his family, though the latter gave countenance to the pretension of the earl of March, as descended by a female from the second son of Edward III.

The cold and cautious address, with which Henry IV. had established his family on the throne, was incapable of conciliating the affections of the people. The permanence of this settlement of the government therefore required, that he should be succeeded by a prince of a different character; and Rapin has remarked[19], that Henry V. was exactly of the temper required by the English, a military reign being necessary for dispelling the ill humours, which had been spread throughout the nation. Devoted in excess to gaiety in his youth, and enlivening it[20] by a spirit of drollery, he was yet even then distinguished[21] by a respectful submission to authority, and he afterwards gratified the nation to the highest degree by the military splendour of

of Wicliffe, they introduced measures, which alarmed the clergy, and the king, to conciliate the latter, ordered the execution of a man, who had been convicted of heresy. The commons expressed their indignation by refusing the demand of Henry.

[18] Hist., vol. iii. p. 85.

[19] Hist., vol. i. pp. 504, 505.

[20] The same character of revelry and dissipation, which we find ascribed to him in the play of Shakspeare, had been given to him in an old play, entitled 'The famous victories of king Henry V.,' from which Shakespeare seems to have taken the character of Falstaff, there given under the name of Sir John Oldcastle.—Malone's Shakspeare, vol. v. p. 120. Lond. 1790.

[21] When he peaceably submitted to the authority of the chief justice, who committed him to prison for insulting him in the administration of justice. He is said to have been afterwards committed by the mayor of Coventry for some irregularity.—Henry, vol. ix. p. 37.

his character. The jealousy of his father, by excluding the young prince from the opportunity of exercising his native powers on the objects, to which they were suited, had driven him to seek recreation in low and unworthy society; but even that temporary degradation may have had an advantageous operation on a mind so richly gifted, as it may have served to soften the severities of a character merely political by the amenities of familiar buffoonery, and thus to have qualified him for conciliating the affection, instead of coldly claiming the respect of the people.

The same reverence for the law, which Henry V. exhibited amidst the intemperance of his youth, we perceive actuating the whole of his government. Not only in the first year of his reign did he give his consent[22] to a number of statutes, which had been framed for the preservation of the public rights, and particularly to one for preventing frauds in the elections of members of parliament, but he constantly forebore to encroach on the liberties of the people[23], and was at all times ready to assent to such acts, as were judged by the parliament to be necessary. When to this respect for the constitution of his country was added the military success, with which he gratified the feelings of the nation, it cannot be deemed surprising that the parliament should have contributed liberally[24] to the support of his government, and even should have been induced, in the triumph of the victory of Agincourt, to grant him for life supplies more considerable than those granted to Richard II. by his last parliament, which were urged against that prince as constituting one of the reasons of his degradation.

It had been the last counsel of his father, that he should not suffer his subjects to continue so long in the enjoyment of foreign peace, as to have leisure for intestine commotion. The advice was sufficiently agreeable to the gallant spirit of the young king, and a most favourable opportunity was presented by the violent contention of the two great factions of France, which disputed the possession of the authority of

[22] Rapin, vol. i. p. 505. [23] Ibid., p. 529. [24] Parl. Hist., vol. ii. p. 147. The grant was accompanied by a provision that it should not become a precedent. The subsidies on the exportation of wool and leather, and the duties of tunnage and poundage, were then first granted for life.

the frenzied and incapable Charles VI. The immediate impulse[25] appears to have been given by the ecclesiastics, anxious to occupy the mind of the king, that he might not be induced to engage in a domestic enterprise against the property of the church. The parliament was earnest in recommending, that a considerable portion of the wealth of the clergy, which to the preceding king[26] had been represented as a third part of the riches of the realm, should be appropriated to the relief of the state. To avert the blow the archbishop of Canterbury, agreeably to a resolution of a synod, urged the king to assert his pretension[27] to the crown of France. The measure had all the effect, which had been expected, for the popularity and success of the war procured the necessary supplies from the laity, without the apprehended spoliation of the clergy. The success indeed was most splendid, Henry having reduced the French to such a condition, that by the treaty of Troyes it was agreed, that he should marry their princess, be declared heir of the monarchy, and be intrusted with the present administration of the government.

Henry V., after a brilliant reign of nine years was succeeded by his son, the sixth of that name, then not quite nine months old. In the long reign of this prince, extended nearly to thirty-nine years, which Hume, on account of the imbecility of his character, has aptly denominated a perpetual minority, the parliament, which had been respected by the apprehensive policy of the first of the Lancastrian princes, and by the unsuspecting generosity and military ambition of the second allowed to exercise its power with freedom, enjoyed an ample opportunity of asserting its importance. We accordingly find this body, in the beginning of the reign of Henry VI., disregarding the directions of the deceased monarch[28], and assuming the right of giving a new arrange-

[25] Parl. Hist., vol. ii. p. 137. [26] Ibid., vol. ii. p. 86. [27] This pretension was however weaker than that of Edward III., not merely as Henry's hereditary title was liable to objection, but also as the same right of succession by a descent from a female, by which the crown of France was claimed, should have conveyed that of England to the earl of March. [28] He had desired that the duke of Bedford should take upon him the government of France, and the duke of Gloucester that of England. The parliament however, to preserve the right of the elder brother, constituted the duke of Bedford protector of England,

ment to the government; and in the conclusion[29] we observe it moderating with the most entire liberty the competition of the two houses of Lancaster and York. Concerning the latter instance Hume has remarked that, though the mildness of the compromise is chiefly to be ascribed to the temperate character of the duke of York, it is impossible not to perceive in the transaction distinguishable marks of a more settled authority of parliament, than had appeared in any former period of the English history.

When the parliament had become thus important in the constitution, it was necessary to ascertain the qualification of those, who might exercise the right of delegating the representative members. This necessity however existed only in regard to the election of representatives of counties. The elective franchise, being considered by the boroughs, as a burthen, was by them much disregarded, and the principal and ruling members of each corporation appear to have gradually acquired a right of acting for the whole[30]. The elections of representatives of counties had on the contrary become tumultuous, and it was found to be necessary to restrain the right to persons interested in the due exercise of it by the possession of a competent property.

Under the government of the Lancastrian princes the right of voting in the elections of the representatives of counties had been first extended, the close elections of the knights by a small number of persons in each county[31], having given occasion to a statute of the seventh year of Henry IV., by which the franchise was communicated to all who were present in the county-courts, 'as well suitors duly summoned for that cause, as others.' The abuse of this regulation was afterwards found to be so great a grievance, that in the eighth year of Henry VI. the franchise was restricted to persons possessing freeholds of the annual value of forty shillings, estimated to have been equivalent to thirty pounds of the present money. This statute has without any modification continued to the present day to mark

giving this dignity to the duke of Gloucester only in the absence of the former. The parliament at the same time nominated the members of the council and the officers of the crown.—Rapin, vol. i. pp. 529, 536.

[29] Hume, vol. iii. pp. 218—220. [30] Hallam's State of Europe during the Middle Ages, vol. ii. pp. 324, 325. [31] Ibid., p. 319.

in England the boundary of the right of election; in the peculiar circumstances of Ireland in regard to Romanists, where also it had been much abused by the emulation of the proprietors of land, it has been recently so modified for that part of the empire, as to fix the limit of the right at the possession of a freehold annually producing ten pounds.

In a general retrospect of the reigns of the three Lancastrian princes we cannot fail to remark a curiously varied adjustment of circumstances to that improvement of the constitution, to which each has been shown to have been separately instrumental. If the agitations of the reign of Henry IV. had been protracted beyond nine years, the government could scarcely have assumed a tranquil and regular form; and if, when he had at length been successful in suppressing them, that prince had continued to reign in the enjoyment of health and vigour, he must have acquired an overbearing ascendency in the government, and have repressed that liberty, which he had before found it expedient to encourage. If Henry V. had not been critically cut off in the very triumph of his successes on the continent, either England would have become a province to her disproportioned acquisition, or have been exhausted in an ineffectual struggle. The imbecility of Henry VI., a child at his accession, and through his whole reign incapable, suspended the efforts of the monarchical part of the constitution, while the royal power was still supported against any undue encroachment of the parliament, partly by the wisdom of the duke of Bedford and the influence of the duke of Gloucester, partly also by the continuance of the French war as it created a necessity of domestic union, that war having been concluded only in the thirty-fifth year of the reign of Henry VI., or four years before its termination.

The reign of Henry VI. had however other relations than those, which directly concerned the power of the parliament, having been the period in which the splendid project of conquering France was renounced, and the great domestic struggle of the two royal houses was begun. The death of the duke of Bedford, which occurred in the year 1435, or the fourteenth year of Henry VI., gave a fatal blow to the English interest in France, then rapidly declining, as it left an open field for the ambitious and violent struggles of the

cardinal of Winchester[32] to overpower the duke of Gloucester, and twelve years of factious contention accelerated the ruin of the foreign acquisition of the nation. The marriage of the king with the celebrated Margaret of Anjou[33], concluded in the year 1443, had largely contributed to the loss of the French provinces, a condition of the marriage having been the cession of the province of Maine to Charles of Anjou, uncle of the queen, by which cession Normandy was exposed. The magnanimity of Margaret on the other hand came in aid of the imbecility of her husband in the domestic struggle with the family of York, in which he was engaged during the last nine years of his reign, the queen valiantly maintaining the contest, while the king in his frequent captivities[34], seemed to be rather the prize, than a party in the strife. It is however remarkable that, in her private cabal for the management of the king, she prepared the success of the rival family by causing the death of her adversary the duke of Gloucester[35], and thereby constituting the duke of York presumptive heir of the crown. Henry had indeed afterwards a lineal heir; but six years had elapsed since the death of the duke of Gloucester, and the hope of the succession had been too long cherished by the duke of York, to be easily abandoned.

The wars of France, by rendering the support of the parliament, and particularly of the commons, necessary to the crown, had afforded the representative part of the constitution a very favourable opportunity of acquiring new powers,

[32] Henry Beaufort, bishop of Winchester, was the legitimated son of John of Ghent, duke of Lancaster, and therefore brother to Henry IV., uncle to Henry V., and great uncle to Henry VI. [33] This princess, the most accomplished of her age both in person and mind, was selected by the cardinal, as fitted to acquire an ascendency over the weak mind of Henry, suitable to the plan of his ambition. She was the daughter of René or Regnier, titular king of Sicily, Naples, and Jerusalem. France, says Sismondi, had doubly avenged herself of her ancient rival, by giving her a king and a queen both sprung from the blood of the family of Valois. Henry VI. had brought to the English the weakness and incapacity of his grandfather Charles VI. of France, and Margaret the pride and imprudence of John and Philip VI.—Hist. des Franc. tome xiii. p. 459. [34] He was taken prisoner by the duke of York in the year 1455, by the earl of Warwick in the year 1460. by Edward IV. in the years 1464 and 1471. [35] Hallam's State of Europe during the Middle Ages, vol. ii. p. 405.

and of confirming them by frequent exertion. When this important improvement of the constitution had been accomplished, it became expedient that the great strength of the aristocracy, which had been a necessary bulwark against the power of the crown, should be reduced, as it would otherwise have proved an inconvenient and embarrassing obstruction in that further improvement, which should give a consistent unity to the diversified action of the government. The civil war of the two royal houses was the severe process, by which this reduction of the aristocracy was primarily effected, having been computed to have cost the lives of more than sixty princes of the blood, and of more than one half of the nobles and principal gentlemen of England[36]. The change, which was thus begun by the war of the two houses, was completed by the policy of Henry VII., in whom the pretensions of the two families were happily united. For perfecting the harmony of the constitution it then remained to bring to an accommodation the opposite pretensions of the crown and the commons, which was done by the struggles with the princes of the house of Stuart, when three of the intermediate sovereigns of the house of Tudor[37] had introduced and established the reformation of religion, and the remaining one[38] had fostered and protected the Roman Catholics.

In a review of the contention of the two houses of Lancaster and York, the character of Richard duke of York, who first advanced the claim of his family, seems to merit some attention. Cautious even to timidity in political contests, yet brave in encountering the perils of war, he seemed to be driven into the competition for the crown by the circumstances of his situation, while his military qualities procured credit for the enterprise. The nation was thus divided into two nearly balanced parties. The spirit of Margaret of Anjou was, notwithstanding the incapacity of her husband, sufficient to counterpoise the irresolute power possessed by the duke, while the very imbecility of the sovereign[39] tended to keep both in suspense, as it disabled the one for any decisive effort, and encouraged the other to hope, that he might peaceably accomplish his purpose. At length, when the

[36] Henry, vol. ix. p. 223. [37] Henry VIII., Edward, and Elizabeth. [38] Mary. [39] Hume, vol. iii. p. 208.

struggle of these factions had been maintained during eight years, the duke was killed in an action with the king's forces, and his son Edward presented himself as the inheritor of his claim, a prince of directly opposite character, bold, enterprising, and severe, and therefore well fitted to make his way through difficulties[40], which would for ever have obstructed the ambition of the father. Neither should it be omitted, that the talents of the father had so conciliated the people of Ireland[41], the government of which he had held, that they afterwards proved steady in their attachment to his cause, a fact the more deserving of notice, as in the reign of Henry VII., when a new series of princes had risen to power, this attachment was the occasion of enacting the statute denominated the law of Poynings, for securing the control of the English government over the parliament of Ireland.

Though three princes of the house of York ascended the throne of England, yet the twenty-four years, during which it was possessed by this family, can scarcely be regarded as comprehending more than a single reign, Edward IV. having reigned twenty-two, and two only having been left for the two remaining princes. Ten years of this first reign were occupied by a continuation of the civil war, which had transferred the monarchy, but could not at once establish the dominion of the new family. While the son of Henry lived, Edward had not a sufficient interest in taking away the life of the father, though within his power; the young prince, however, having been put to death in the year 1471, when he had been taken prisoner in the battle of Tewksbury, the death of the father, then confined in the tower, speedily followed[42], and no one remained to contest the right of the family of York. The earl of Warwick[43], who had perished in the battle, was the greatest, as well as the last, of those powerful barons, who had so frequently overawed their sovereign.

[40] Hume, vol. iii. p. 229. [41] Ibid., pp. 191, 347. [42] Doctor Lingard has refuted Mr. Laing and Mr. Malone, who both laboured to prove that Henry did not die on the evening of the day, on which Edward entered London, that they might clear the memory of Richard, brother of Edward, from his murder.—Hist., vol. v. pp. 288, 289. note.

[43] This earl, commonly known by the name of *king-maker*, had been chiefly instrumental in placing Edward IV. on the throne, and afterwards, having been offended by this prince, effected the temporary restoration of Henry VI.

During the remaining twelve years of his reign, the king, devoted to pleasure, seemed almost to have forgotten the duties of his station in the enjoyment of his security; but by his inoffensive gaiety he recovered the popularity[44], which must have been lost by the cruelties previously practised upon his enemies, and the people thus became attached to the government, and alienated from the contentions, in which they had been so long engaged. This pleasurable disposition had indeed before exercised a two-fold influence on his struggle with the deposed king. On the one hand, by hurrying him into an imprudent marriage with the lady Elizabeth Gray, which raised a new family to power, it had given offence to the earl of Warwick[45], to whom he was indebted for his elevation; on the other, it was the source of much of that popularity[46], by which he was supported in the contest, and the attachment of the ladies of London has been mentioned by a contemporary historian[47], as one of the causes, which co-operated to effect his re-establishment, when he had for a few months been driven from the throne[48].

The love of pleasure, which so strongly influenced the conduct of Edward IV., was not less important in its relation to the external concerns of the state. The English, though deprived of almost the whole of their possessions in France, still retained their pretensions, and it was in the natural order of events that the founder of a new dynasty, when he had been successful in gratifying his ambition at home, should seek to exercise in a foreign enterprise the energies of a people long accustomed to war. It may accordingly be ascribed to the pleasurable disposition of the English monarch, that a powerful effort was not then made for the recovery of France. Once indeed he was induced to lead an army to the assistance of the duke of Burgundy his brother-in-law; but he appears[49] to have engaged in this enterprise only with the

[44] Hume, vol. iii. pp. 268, 269. [45] This matter has been minutely examined by doctor Lingard (vol. v. p. 257, note), who has justly rejected the received account of the quarrel. To the jealousy of the new family was afterwards added the dissatisfaction felt by the earl at the plan of a marriage, to be concluded between the king's sister and the son of the duke of Burgundy. [46] Hume, vol. iii. p. 240.

[47] Comines, liv. iii. ch. vi.; [48] England exhibited at one moment the extraordinary spectacle of two rival kings, each confined in prison, Henry in the Tower, Edward in Yorkshire.—Lingard, vol. v. p. 264.

[49] He brought with him ten or twelve of the chief citizens of England,

design of appropriating to his own gratification the money granted by the parliament for the war, which would not have been granted for any other purpose, and he was well pleased to relinquish it for certain sums of money, to be paid by the French king, which he was permitted to dignify with the name of tribute. The chief persons of his court imitated the selfish policy of their master, by receiving from the crafty Louis XI.[50] various pensions, amounting together to the annual sum of sixteen thousand crowns.

The short remainder of the period of the house of York, comprehending little more than two years, was but the crisis of transition to the new dynasty of Tudor begun by Henry VII., as it was filled with the crimes and usurpation of Richard, uncle of Edward V., who within a few months effected[51] the destruction of the young prince and his brother, when he had already taken possession of the throne, having caused the marriage of their father to be represented as having been void[52] on account of a former engagement. Its influence in favouring the change of the succession appears to have consisted in bringing forward a claimant of the crown, who was supported by a weaker[53] against a more powerful party, which had been alienated from an usurper, but was still attached to his family[54]. The importance of such a situation of the first prince of the new dynasty will appear, when it shall have been considered that the object of his reign was to complete the reduction of the excessive power of the nobles, an object naturally proposed by a prince, who found that he had to struggle for the maintenance of his power, though he had strengthened his title by a marriage with the daughter of Edward IV. His own title

who had been active in promoting the war, that they, being weary of the service, might employ their influence in pacifying the people, when he should have concluded a peace.—Comines, liv. iv. ch. xi.

[50] Ibid., ch. viii. [51] This question has been examined and satisfactorily decided by doctor Lingard, vol. v. p. 469, note. [52] The pre-contract, which has been warmly maintained by Walpole in his Historic Doubts, and by Laing in a dissertation at the close of Henry's History of England, has been disproved by doctor Lingard.—Ibid., p. 465, note.

[53] Hume, vol. iii. pp. 416, 418. [54] Of that family there remained as claimants of the crown, John de la Pole earl of Lincoln, nephew of Richard III., and named by him to the succession after the death of his son; and Edward Plantagenet, son to the late duke of Clarence, created earl of Warwick by Edward IV.—Lingard, vol. v. p. 370.

indeed rested on a very weak foundation, for his right of descent from the duke of Lancaster had been conveyed through an illegitimate branch, which had been excluded from the succession by an act of parliament.

Though the reduction of the aristocracy has been represented as a process important to the improvement of the government, it should be observed that Hume has much exaggerated the irregularity of the constitution at this period, in saying that[55], from the accession of Edward I. to the death of Richard III., a kind of Polish aristocracy prevailed, and though the kings were limited, the people were yet far from being free. The gradual increase of the power of the commons, under the Lancastrian princes, has on the contrary been already proved; and even in the reign of Edward IV., though the period of the ascendency of the house of York was tumultuary, and therefore unfavourable to the regular development of constitutional principles, we observe them endeavouring, with a most distrustful caution[56], to secure from the discretionary management of the king the supplies, which they had voted for a war with France. How far the general condition of the people was removed from that degraded state in which they have been represented by Hume, appears from the unquestionable testimony of Philip de Comines, who declared[57] that the government was in no other country so well managed, nor the people so little exposed to violence and oppression; and that the calamities of war fell only upon the soldiers, and especially upon the nobles, the latter being regarded with an extraordinary jealousy. Sir John Fortescue too, the chief justice and chancellor of Henry VI., has assigned as the reason[58], why the trial by jury was not practised in other nations of Europe, that a middle class of proprietors, fit for constituting juries, could be found only in England.

The systematic reduction of the aristocracy has been especially referred to the reign of Henry VII., to whom it appears to have been an object of policy. This policy consisted partly in declining to employ the nobles in the great

[55] Lingard, vol. v. p. 326. [56] One part of the sums voted on this occasion was to be kept in religious houses, and if the king should not invade France, was to be immediately refunded to the people. Ibid., p. 270. [57] Liv. v. ch. xviii. [58] De laudibus legum Angliæ, cap. xxix.

offices of state, and advancing lawyers and ecclesiastics, whom he found more obsequious to his wishes, and could more easily reward for their services, partly in encouraging the alienation of their estates. The statute, by which the latter was effected, has been represented as devised for the express purpose of breaking the entails of the estates of the nobles. It has, however, no direct reference to entails, and merely provides for the more effectual execution of a statute of Edward I., by which fines levied in the king's court were made conclusive against adverse claimants. The alienation of estates was in this manner much facilitated; but the expedient, by which entails were broken, had already been devised by the clergy[59] to evade the statutes of mortmain, and adopted afterwards by the lawyers for the purpose of unfettering estates, that they might be liable to forfeiture.

The power of the crown was much augmented in this reign by a combination of various causes. The people, weary of the disorders by which they had been so long harassed, were prepared for submitting to any authority, which might procure for them the enjoyment of tranquillity: the great nobles had been either destroyed, or much impoverished in the civil wars, and the people were thus deprived of the leaders, under whom they had been accustomed to act: of the factions left by those wars, that of Lancaster, which was attached to Henry, was the weaker, and therefore was ready to extend and maintain his power, as the best protection for themselves: the character of the prince too was singularly accommodated to the circumstances, in which he was placed, as he was distinguished at once by a cool and cautious sagacity, and by an inflexible steadiness: the insurrections also, which agitated his reign, served by a necessary consequence to confirm and enlarge the authority, which they had vainly endeavoured to overthrow: and the general changes of society, tending to depress the nobles, while the commons were not elevated with equal rapidity, co-operated, though at this period not very powerfully, with the efforts of the sovereign.

In every part of his conduct Henry appears to have been steadily attentive to the accumulation of money, probably considering it as the best support of his power. His de-

[59] Blackstone, Comm., book iv. ch. 33.

mands for the sacrifice of Brittany were wholly pecuniary; and it has been remarked[60] that, as he was enriched by his subjects for the war, so did he make profit of his enemies for the peace. In the earlier part of his reign he was restrained in the indulgence of this propensity by the agitations[61], which disturbed his government; but, when he was at length quietly established on the throne, he turned all his thoughts to this his favourite gratification, and soon found two agents of his avarice, Empson and Dudley, who became infamous for their extortions[62]. By the shameful exactions, which these men practised with his approbation, and by a rigid frugality in his expenses, he is said to have possessed in money one million eight hundred thousand pounds, a prodigious treasure when the influx of the precious metals from America had not yet reduced the value of money. Thus the crown, which had been impoverished, was exceedingly enriched, while those of the nobles, who had survived the civil wars, were both necessitated and encouraged to alienate their properties.

But, however grievous were the oppressions practised by Henry VII. for procuring money, his government did not outrage the constitutional rights of the parliament. His

[60] Bacon, Op. Omn. p. 1051. Francof., 1665. [61] In the year 1486 a feeble effort was made in the north by the friends of the family of York. In the same year Lambert Simnel, a youth of obscure birth, was employed to personate the second son of Edward IV., who was said to have escaped from the cruelty of his uncle Richard III., and Ireland was easily engaged to revolt in his cause. In the year 1488 the counties of Durham and York again rose in arms, but were speedily reduced. Lastly, Perkin Warbeck, in the year 1492, began an insurrection, which was suppressed only in the year 1497, the same pretence being employed in that case as in that of Lambert Simnel. All disturbance ceased in the year 1499, when the earl of Warwick was executed. [62] To prove that these extortions were qualified by some regard to justice, Bacon remarks that he had seen a book of the accounts of Empson, almost every page of which the king had subscribed, inserting in some places observations with his own hand; and that in this book there was a memorandum written by Empson, stating that five marks had been received for procuring the pardon of some offender, which sum was to be repaid if no pardon were granted, unless the person who paid it should be otherwise satisfied, with these words written in the margin by the king, 'otherwise satisfied.'—Bacon, p. 1113. This anecdote, however, proves only that they were systematically managed.

plan was to govern his subjects by laws[63], but to govern the laws by lawyers; and he even frequently submitted to the consideration of the parliament[64] measures properly belonging to the executive authority, as the regulation of the coin, the military administration, and the determination of war and peace. Indeed the causes, which so much favoured his power, had given to him such an ascendency over the house of commons, that his agent Dudley was chosen speaker in his last parliament, when the extortions, of which this man was an instrument, were most galling. The reduction of the power of the aristocracy seems to have extended its influence for the time to the house of commons, the previous efforts of which had probably been instigated and animated by the nobles. A parliament in these circumstances, instead of exciting jealousy, was naturally considered as a useful assistant in the management of the government. It was accordingly employed by Henry to give a statutable form and authority to the court of starchamber, that he might be enabled to strip the nobles of those trains of liveried followers, by which they set at defiance the control of the sovereign.

The laws of this prince were not however directed solely to the aggrandisement of his power, but justify the eulogy bestowed on them by Bacon[65], who has pronounced him to have been second only to Edward I. as an English legislator. 'His laws,' says this eminent man, 'are deep and not 'vulgar; not made upon the spur of a particular occasion 'for the present, but out of providence of the future to 'make the estate of his people still more and more happy, 'after the manner of the legislators in ancient and heroical 'times.' The general object of his law was to abate the oppression of the powerful; to prevent the extortions which were practised under the colour of law; to repress the audacity of the lawless part of the people, and to check the general prevalence of corruption and perjury. If he was solicitous to accumulate money for himself, he appears to have been not less solicitous to procure happiness for his people.

[63] Bacon, p. 1076. [64] Ibid., p. 1126. [65] This has been controverted by Mr. Hallam in his Constitutional History of England, vol. i. pp. 14, &c. But the eulogy of Bacon has been well maintained against Mr. Hallam in the 73rd number of the Quarterly Review.

The love of money, which characterised Henry, gave in one instance occasion to a memorable and most important revolution. He had concluded a marriage for his elder son Arthur with Catherine infanta of Spain; the young prince however died in the fourth month after the nuptials had been solemnised; and the king was tempted by the desire of retaining the marriage portion, two hundred thousand crowns, to assent to a proposal of the king of Spain, that the young widow should be married to her brother-in-law Henry, then the heir apparent of the English throne[66]. A dispensation for celebrating a marriage thus irregular had been procured from the pope; and the question, which afterwards arose concerning the validity of that dispensation, gave occasion to the separation of England from the see and church of Rome.

Another marriage, solemnised between Margaret the eldest daughter of Henry, and James IV. of Scotland, had not only the present effect of averting a war between the neighbouring kingdoms, but eventually of uniting the two crowns[67] and at length of incorporating the two governments into the one kingdom of Great Britain. A papal dispensation was in this case also required and procured[68], but, as the marriage was never questioned, it had no consequences.

Hume has represented[69], that a power almost absolute was necessary in this period for completing that reduction of aristocratic tyranny, which had been begun by the civil wars, but was still very incomplete. The great increase of the power of the crown appears however on the contrary to have been a consequence of the humiliation of a nobility, by which it had been rivalled. A more just conception of the bearing of the aggrandisement of the royal power may perhaps be formed, by comparing the state of the government,

[66] This marriage was not however solemnised in the reign of Henry VII., the whole of the marriage-portion not having been paid before his death.—Lingard, vol. v. pp. 455, 456. [67] When some of his council expressed a fear that then, on failure of the male line, England might hereafter become an appendage to the Scotish crown, 'No,' replied Henry, 'Scotland will become an appendage to the English, for the smaller must follow the larger kingdom.'—Ibid., p. 441.

[68] The parties were related within the prohibited degrees, and the princess was not of sufficient age to make a contract valid in law.—Lingard, vol. v. pp. 441, 442. [69] Hist., vol. iii. p. 326.

as it existed under the princes of the house of Tudor, with that which it had held under the Norman princes, who like them had possessed an overbearing power.

It is generally admitted, that the great aggrandisement of the royal authority at the conquest served to compress into political union a feudal aristocracy with the inferior orders of the people, and thus to dispose the nobles, who alone at that time were capable of the effort, to vindicate the general rights of the community. By the resistance of the aristocracy, thus supported by the people, the royal power was accordingly controlled for a time; but that aristocracy was reduced by the civil wars, while the commons were assuming political importance, and another period of compression appears to have been then required, for forming to its function this other member of the constitution. The increased power of the princes of the house of Tudor seems to have been the instrument of this new process. The commons, long depressed under these princes, were prepared for those efforts, by which they rose against the crown under the succeeding family of the Stuarts; and the distinction between the two cases of the Tudors and of the Norman sovereigns appears to consist only in this, that the great power of the Norman princes was the result of foreign invasion, which also gave being to a feudal aristocracy, whereas that of the princes of the house of Tudor was a consequence of civil dissensions, by which that aristocracy was deprived of its strength.

Bacon has remarked[70], that Louis XI. of France, Ferdinand of Spain, and Henry VII. of England, may be considered as three *magi* among the princes of their age; and it is a very remarkable circumstance, that three princes so eminently distinguished by political wisdom should about the same time occupy the thrones of these three principal countries of Europe, just as a crisis was approaching so fruitful of the most important events as the sixteenth century. Each of these princes laboured to depress the nobility, which rivalled and controlled the authority of his throne. It was however the peculiar fortune of the English government, that the power taken from the nobles was transferred to the commons, not to the sovereign. The practice of alien-

[70] Op. Omn. p. 1132.

ation, begun by the policy of ecclesiastics and lawyers, and facilitated by the statute of fines, conveyed silently to the lower orders of the English people much of the property of their superiors; and the constitution had already, by the formation of the house of commons, provided for them a political organ, by which their new acquisitions might exercise a legitimate influence on the administration of the government.

CHAPTER VIII.

Of the history of Russia, from the building of Kiof in the year 430, *to the end of the reign of Ivan III. in the year* 1505.

Kiof founded in the year 430—Novgorod founded, 450—Reign of Ruric begun, 864—Greek Church embraced and established by Vladimir—Decline of Russia begun, 1015—Domination of the Tatars begun, 1243—terminated by Ivan III., 1462.

It has been already remarked, that the various relations of the governments of modern Europe may be resolved into two distinguishable, though connected systems of policy; a principal one composed of the central and southern governments, and a secondary one consisting of those of the northern regions. The preceding part of this work has been employed in reviewing the origin and earlier combination of the former of these two systems; in this chapter, and the two which immediately follow it, a view shall be taken of the origin and combination of the latter within the same interval of time.

In the consideration of the northern system of Europe, Russia is manifestly the principal object. Stretching from Poland and Sweden on the west to the immediate vicinity of America on the east, it occupied much of the north of Europe, and the whole of that of Asia: its great variety of climates and soils furnished it by an interior commerce, though not with the luxuries, yet with all the necessaries of life, and from its eastern provinces with an ample supply of

the precious metals: and, while the eastern nations have found their way to its markets with the productions of more luxurious regions, the nations of the west have sought in this great empire the means of maritime greatness, by purchasing the naval stores, with which it abounded. A country possessing means of superiority thus considerable and various, well deserves to be regarded as the principal member of a system. It was long barbarous in comparison with the improved communities, which constituted the southern and principal system of Europe; but it exhibited the dignity of a rude colossus in the vicinity of the more finished, though diminutive productions, of more cultivated art.

The secondary system of Europe, consisting of the four governments of Russia, Poland, Denmark, and Sweden, with the dependent state of Norway, embraced two distinct classes of original population, the Slavian tribes, which chiefly furnished the inhabitants of Russia and Poland[1], and the Gothic or Teutonic, which principally supplied those of the more western countries. In this part of the arrangement of the system we observe a distinctness of population, which appears to have maintained the distinctness of its principal member, the Russian government, from the southern and more considerable system of Europe, into which it might otherwise have been prematurely absorbed, while the German character of the population of the less important governments, those of Denmark, Sweden, and Norway, served at the same time to form a communication, by which in the more modern period of the history of Europe the superior improvement of that other system might be transmitted to it without confounding the separation, which distributed the various governments of Europe into two combinations of political interests. If too, which seems not improbable, this northern empire be the destined instrument of improvement for the northern countries of Asia, while the British should

[1] Though the tribes denominated Slavians formed the principal part of the inhabitants of Russia, yet the name of the country has been derived from a distinct tribe, bearing originally the name of Russians. According to the Tatar prince Abulgasi-Bayadur, and the writers cited by D'Herbelot, the Slavians have sprung from Seklab, or Sakleb, and the Russians from Rouss, both sons of Japheth.—Hist. de Russie par L'Evesque, tome i. p. 3. Hambourg et Brunswick, 1800. No such names however occur in the enumeration of the sons of Japheth given in the book of Genesis, but Gomer, Magog, Madai, Javan, Tubal, Meshech, and Tiras.

discharge the same function in the regions of the south, the Tatar character of its population may in this other respect also exercise an important influence, by connecting it with the countries, upon which it is to act.

Nor was the diversity of local position less aptly suited to the several functions of the various members of this northern system. Russia, besides that it was closely connected with northern Asia, bordered also the territory of the Greek empire, and thus was favourably circumstanced for receiving from it an original stock of refinement, which, however impaired by the barbarism of succeeding ages, yet facilitated the introduction of modern civilisation; and the same locality, aided by the adoption of the Greek form of Christianity, itself one of the results of that situation, appears to promise another very important result in no distant period, by favouring the acquisition of the capital, with some of the provinces, of European Turkey. Poland in its position, together with its population, partook of the character of Russia, as it participated its functions in the combinations of Europe, and has finally been almost wholly absorbed into its empire. Denmark on the other hand was locally connected with the northern provinces of Germany, and has served also to connect that empire with the two governments of the Scandinavian peninsula, which formed with itself a little combination of balanced dominion, auxiliary and subordinate to the paramount interests of Russia, the primary member of the system of the north.

The Slavian, it has been already remarked, appear to have been of a less warlike character than the Gothic nations; and in confirmation of this remark it may be observed, that in the general system of their religion[2] no divinity has been described with the attributes of a god of war, but on the contrary a god of peace was acknowledged. Driven forward, as it appears[3], by the pressure of the Chinese empire, they merely pushed the Goths onward upon the empire of Rome, seeking for themselves settlements, in which they might be placed beyond the power of their Asiatic enemies.

[2] There appears however to have been a deity of this character among a portion of this people. L'Evesque, tomei. p. 36. [3] Tableaux Historiques de l'Asie, &c., par Klaproth, pp. 67, 233, &c. Paris et Londres, 1826.

They seem to have been too low in civilisation to be actuated by the love of military enterprise.

The peaceable disposition of a people so circumstanced was well suited to the geographical position of the country, which it occupied, for this position afforded peculiar advantages of commerce. Spreading from Constantinople, then the seat of opulence and refinement, to the Baltic, which was the commercial channel of the north-western regions of Europe, this country naturally became a road of traffic connecting the greater with the less Mediterranean, and consequently in that early period attained a degree of improvement then unknown in the other countries of the north. The influence of commerce was apparent in the aggrandisement of two cities, Kiof and Novgorod, especially of the latter[4], which long continued to be a powerful republic. Their positions were well adjusted to the trade by which they flourished, the former communicating with the Black Sea by the Dnieper, and the other being in the vicinity of the Gulf of Finland. Of the two stations Novgorod, which was the less ancient, became much the more considerable, because it was adjacent to the countries, the commodities of which attracted the traders of Constantinople, and the cataracts of the Dnieper[5] formed a considerable obstruction to the communication between Kiof and the eastern capital.

Lost as the early refinement of Russia has been in the barbarism of a succeeding period, the improvement of Russia has been supposed to have been for the first time created by the imitative genius of some more modern sovereigns, when it was in truth but recovered, like that of southern Europe, from a temporary ruin. Vladimir I., who reigned in the beginning of the eleventh century, invited skilful workmen[6] from Greece to embellish with churches and palaces the country, which his government had rendered prosperous. Before the middle of the same century the art of painting,

[4] Novgorod, or *the new city*, attained early to so considerable power, that it was commonly said, 'who can contend with God, or Novgorod the Great?' To this city surrounding nations were tributary, from Lithuania to the mountains bordering Siberia, and from the Bielo-Ozero and the lake of Rostof to the White-Sea.—L'Evesque, tome i. pp. 57—59. Novgorod appears to have been built by Slavians, Kiof by the original Russians.—Ibid., pp. 49, 50. [5] L'Evesque, tome i. p. 135. [6] Ibid., p. 162.

then not known in Italy, was received in Russia from Greece, and with mosaic work[7] was employed in ornamenting the church of saint Sophia at Novgorod. In the year 1075[8] the magnificence of the presents of the Russian monarch, consisting of gold, silver, and valuable stuffs, exciting astonishment in the court of Henry IV. of Germany. Two years afterwards[9] such were the comparative opulence and luxury of Russia, that the troops of Poland, employed there in re-establishing the sovereign on the throne, found that country as pernicious to their discipline, as Capua had been to the army of Hannibal. The wealth of Greece had indeed flowed into Russia[10] through various channels. The people of this northern region had long maintained a commercial connexion with the eastern empire; they had sometimes in war possessed themselves of its treasures; sometimes they had taken them from barbarians, by whom it had been pillaged. Nor was the early refinement of Russia confined to the introduction of the opulence and the arts of Greece, but was extended also to its literature. Vladimir is described[11] as even using force to procure students for the schools, which he founded; and the same prince[12], who afterwards embellished with the arts the church of saint Sophia, is represented as being himself an indefatigable student, and as employing a great number of copyists in transcribing Greek compositions, that he might deposit copies in the same edifice. The political relations too of this country corresponded to so much interior improvement. Not forgotten by the other states of Europe, as in a subsequent period, it was then connected by marriages[13] with the

[7] These works, which still subsist, are destitute of beauty; but the art was not cultivated with greater success at Constantinople, and the rude paintings of Greece and Russia were of more value than the barbarous sculptures, with which the Romish churches of Europe were then loaded. The paintings are described as executed on a ground of gold. Such were the productions of the eleventh century. From the twelfth the Russians have executed paintings, which have merited the eulogies of modern Italians. Among these were the representations of the Greek saints, distinguished by the name of *the Capponian Tablets*, because they had been procured by Gregory Capponi from a Greek, to whom they had been given by Peter I.—L'Evesque, tome ii. p. 121. [8] Ibid., tome i. p. 182. [9] Ibid., p. 185.
[10] Ibid., p. 182. [11] Ibid., p. 135. [12] Ibid., p. 161.
[13] Ibid., p. 164. Vladimir, the eldest son of the king, married the

houses of the king of Poland, the second Harold of England, the emperor of Constantinople, the kings of Norway and Hungary, and the prince-bishop of Treves, thus extending its alliances through the north, and from Greece to England.

This original improvement of Russia was crushed by the domination of the Tatars, which was established in the year 1243, and subsisted during more than two centuries, having been suppressed only in the year 1462, when Ivan III. was advanced to the throne. The prosperity of the country had however begun to decline more than two centuries before the dominion of the Tatars was erected, the year 1015 having been marked[14] as the epoch of its deterioration and decay, occurring even in the eleventh century, which has been described as so distinguished by refinement.

The earliest event of the history of Russia, which has been recorded, is the building of Kiof, which has been referred to the year 430[15]. Towards the middle of the same century[16] was also founded, near the lake Ilmen, the city of Novgorod, which long continued to possess a considerable importance in the government. From this time to the ninth century the history of Russia is a blank, nor can its monarchy be traced further than the year 864, in which Rurik became possessed of the entire royalty. The commerce of Novgorod[17] had rendered it republican, and its republican constitution had engendered civil dissension, by which the community was enfeebled. In the year 862 accordingly the inhabitants, who were Slavians, being probably threatened with hostility by some neighbouring tribe, placed themselves under the protection of three brothers, belonging to a tribe denominated Varaigue-Russians, the former part of which appellation signifies inhabitants of the coast. During two years the three brothers divided among themselves the territory, which they had been called to defend; but two of them having died at the end of that time without leaving any issue, Rurik in the year 864 found himself in the sole possession of the government. The name of his tribe was communicated to the nation.

The new monarch immediately distributed the towns of

daughter of Harold, who afterwards became the last of the Saxon kings of England. [14] L'Evesque, tome ii. p. 53. [15] Ibid., tome i. p. 44. [16] Ibid., pp. 46, 47. [17] Ibid., pp. 57—63.

his kingdom among his principal chiefs; but it is not known whether they were merely intrusted to the chiefs as governments, or granted to them as feudal benefices. The great number of towns[18], which existed in Russia from the earliest period, however inferior to the cities of countries highly improved, indicates at least some degree of social combination and settled industry. This is yet more distinctly marked in the early references to laws, which attest at once the equity and the reflection of the people, among whom they were maintained. From a treaty[19] concluded with the Greek emperor in the year 912, it appears that the Russians had even then established laws, by which a murderer, instead of merely paying a fine, was punished with death, and a widow was entitled to a determined portion of the property of her husband, secured to her even in cases of forfeiture; and also that the practice of making bequests by will, and consequently that of writing, were then familiar.

Rurik[20] in a peaceful reign of fifteen years found leisure for consolidating his government. He was succeeded by his son Igor, an infant; but he had provided against the calamities of a minor's reign, by naming to the regency one of his relatives, who during thirty-three years was the real sovereign, and conducted the affairs of the government with ability and success. The regent[21] in the year 879 became master of Kiof, the other of the two principal cities of Russia, and made it the seat of his government. To this measure he appears to have been determined by a desire of attacking Constantinople, which attracted his avidity, as it was the source of the opulence of Russia. His efforts, however, terminated in the treaty, which has been already quoted; and in the following year he left to the son of Rurik the authority, which he had so long withheld.

The hope of gaining possession of the riches of the Greek capital furnished the motive of the removal of the seat of government; and the advantage of this removal, though in a different way, was brought to trial within thirty-six years from the acquisition of the new capital, for in the year 915[22] it was attacked by the tribe of Petcheneguians, which had come from the banks of the Volga and the Jaik, and long

[18] L'Evesque, tome i. pp. 67, 68. [19] Ibid., pp. 76—78. [20] Ibid., p. 66. [21] Ibid., pp. 70, 75. [22] Ibid., p. 83.

continued to be its most formidable enemies. As the eastern tribes pressed onward from the countries adjacent to the Caspian Sea, it became important that the capital of this frontier sovereignty should be in the neighbourhood of the pass, through which they directed their progress.

The reign of Igor, the second sovereign, was followed by another minority, which gave occasion to a female regency[23], the mother of the young prince assuming the reins of government. The queen was however aided by the counsels and the valour of a general, who had been liberally rewarded by her deceased husband for his former services. The influence of the preceding minority, ably conducted as the government was by the regent, appears to have consisted in habituating the Russians to acknowledge the hereditary right of the family of Rurik; that of this other in favouring the introduction of the Christian religion among that people. The queen, having heard of this religion in Kiof, where a prince of that place had received baptism before it fell into the possession of the Russians[24], determined to embrace it; and that she might receive baptism with greater solemnity, and acquire at the same time a more distinct knowledge of her new profession, made a progress to the capital of the Greek empire, where the emperor assisted at the reception of the distinguished proselyte. The time indeed was not yet arrived, when the rude nation could be induced to adopt generally a religion of peace, and even the young prince, apprehensive of ridicule[25], declined to imitate the example of his mother. Still however the propagation of Christianity must have been powerfully assisted by the influence of that female piety, which had thus given it for a time the sanction of the sovereign authority.

The growth and prosperity of the early government of Russia was comprehended within a space of a hundred and fifteen years, which commenced with the reign of Rurik in the year 864, and ended with that of Vladimir I. in the year 1015. That part of this period, which followed the female regency, was occupied by three reigns, the first of which

[23] L'Evesque, tome i. p. 91. [24] Ibid., pp. 65, 66, 98—100.

[25] Do you wish, replied the young prince to the pious exhortations of his mother, that my friends should deride me?—L'Evesque, tome i. p. 100.

was that of a successful warrior, and the third that of Vladimir, who for his various virtues was deservedly denominated the great, the intermediate reign being a short one of seven years, engrossed by the contention of two brothers for the crown.

That the military successes of the first of these three sovereigns, Suiateslaf I., and the eminent greatness of the last, were conducive to the aggrandisement of the government, requires no elucidation. The intervening period of agitation appears to have acted beneficially in diverting the attention of the government from a plan of establishing the seat of empire on the banks of the Danube[26], which would have totally confounded the system of the north. For executing this plan Suiateslaf exerted repeated efforts; and it may be presumed that Vladimir, if a short interval of domestic contention had not drawn his attention to the interior regulation of the government, would have been tempted to prosecute the same purpose.

Some of the efforts of the latter prince for the improvement of his people have been already mentioned. He also administered to the wants of his poorer subjects[27], sent colonies into the less peopled regions of his dominions, and erected towns; and he first gave a formal sanction to the profession of the Christian religion, which soon afterwards became general among his subjects[28], in conformity to an edict of the sovereign. The merits of his efforts to illuminate the minds of his people by education may be estimated from the resistance, by which he was opposed, it having been found necessary to force the children from their parents, that they might be placed in the new academies. His adoption of Christianity[29] is said to have been the result of various embassies sent to him almost at the same time by

[26] L'Evesque, tome i. p. 107. [27] Ibid., pp. 134, 135. [28] He issued one day in Kiof an order, directing all the inhabitants to present themselves the next morning on the banks of the river, that they might receive baptism; and they obeyed with joy. If this were not right, they said, the prince and the boiars would not have done it. Ibid., p. 130. [29] This recital is taken from the Russian chronicles. A Greek manuscript of the Colbertine library, published by Banduri, refers the same facts to the reign of Basil the Macedonian, and consequently to an earlier conversion, which had preceded the conquest of Kiof by the Russians.—Ibid., p. 124, note.

the Roman pontiff, or perhaps by some prince of the same faith, who wished to attach him to the church of Rome; by the people of Great Bulgaria, who exhorted him to embrace the religion of Mohammed; and even by some Jews settled among the Kozares, who desired to proselyte him to the law of Moses. A Greek, who addressed him on the subject of religion, was however more successful in deciding the choice of the monarch. The pomp of its ceremonial is said to have determined him to embrace the tenets of the Greek church, though his choice might perhaps with greater probability be referred to the influence of the ancient intercourse between the Russians and the Greek capital. Whatever may have been the cause, his resolution, formed more than eight centuries before the present time, gave being to a principle of union between the Russians and the Greek subjects of the Ottoman government, which has subsisted to the present time.

While Vladimir was thus acting as the patriotic improver of his nation, the ferociousness of his age and country was strangely manifested in his conduct. Not having among his people any Greek priests for the instruction of himself and his subjects, he found it necessary to procure them from the empire; his pride however revolted at the idea of soliciting them as a favour, for he conceived that this would be a homage unworthy of his independence, and he therefore determined to obtain them by arms as prisoners of war. His hostilities had at the same time the further effect of extorting from the two princes, who then shared the throne of Constantinople, their consent, that their sister should become the wife of the sovereign of Russia.

The first principle of the decay of Russia[30] was the division of the territory into appanages for the support of the several branches of the reigning family, a practice begun indeed by the father of Vladimir, but carried to a greater extent by himself, as he left a more numerous issue. His successors imitated these examples, and the original appanages were themselves divided to make provision for succeeding generations. Thus in the progress of time Russia became parcelled into a multitude of petty sovereignties, a great number of which were merely villages, and a sort of feudal

[30] L'Evesque, tome i. p. 136.

government was formed, the chiefs of which were princes of the blood of Rurik. When the country had been thus divided, it was so enfeebled by the dissensions, which arose among numerous chieftains, all anxious to assert their independence, that it at length fell under the power of barbarians, whom it might have defied[31], if it had not been weakened by disunion.

Some intervals however of returning vigour may be noticed, even after the decline of Russia had commenced. Jaroslaf, who reigned in the earlier part of the eleventh century[32], has been respected as the first legislator of this country[33]. Andrew I.[34] also after the middle of the twelfth century laboured to reduce the petty principalities, which distracted the monarchy. The scheme was however too great for the life of a single man, especially for one prematurely terminated by assassination, and followed by an agitated interregnum; but he was successful in reducing to a nominal dependence the powerful republic of Novgorod, which was so considerable as to have been constituted a member of the hanseatic confederacy.

The reduction of Novgorod was not completed, until three centuries had elapsed from its commencement, having been accomplished in the year 1475 by the same sovereign[35], who also terminated the domination of the Tatars, which during more than two had held Russia in subjection. It appears to have been important that the vigorous principle of independence should continue to subsist in this community through the long period of national humiliation[36], that it might protect the harassed country from the inroads of its European

[31] L'Evesque, tome ii. p. 53. [32] He ascended the throne in the year 1015, was driven from it in the year 1018, was re-established in the following year, and died in the year 1054. [33] It is observable that a trial by twelve men chosen for the purpose is prescribed by those laws.—Ibid., tome i. p. 169. [34] The trade of Novgorod was important to the confederacy, not merely for the productions of the adjacent country, but also for those of India, which were carried through Bucharia to Astracan, and by the Volga and other rivers to Novgorod.—Ibid., p. 305. [35] Ibid., tome ii. p. 338. [36] The Tatars in the year 1238 advanced within a distance of twenty leagues from Novgorod, but suddenly and unaccountably returned towards Rezan, an event ascribed by the Russian chronicles to a miraculous interposition.—Ibid., p. 90. The republic was afterwards rendered tributary, but never plundered.

neighbours, the Lithuanians, the Livonians, the Danes, and the Swedes, who beheld in its distresses only an opportunity of their own aggrandisement. The decay of Novgorod, which very speedily followed its entire reduction, affords a proof of the efficacy of its preceding independence in maintaining its prosperity and power. Its territory, its population, its commerce, and its wealth, suffered a constant diminution; and before a century elapsed, almost every vestige of its former importance had been obliterated.

In the year 1168 the ruin of Kiof rendered Volodimer[37], a city of much more northerly situation, and not very remote from Moscow, incontestably the capital of Russia, as it had in reality been eleven years before that event. The exposed situation of the former capital had dictated the change. Infested at once by various tribes of Tatars[38], and by the less barbarous nations of Hungary, Lithuania, and Poland, and ravaged in the contentions of the princes, who were all ambitious of adding this possession to their appanages, Kiof became unfit for the residence of the sovereign. This southern capital had favoured the intercourse with the Greek empire, which had been the channel of the improvement of Russia; but at this time Constantinople was itself pressed by the hostilities of the Turks, and within thirty-five years was actually overpowered by its Christian allies of the west[39].

When Russia had continued to decline through more than two centuries, an irruption of the Tatars reduced it to subjection. Weakened by its always increasing subdivision[40], it was at length unable to resist the conquerors of Asia, and its feebleness was at this particular crisis increased by the accession of a sovereign distinguished only by alternate extremes of cowardice, and presumption[41]. The circumstances of this irruption render it a curious example of the influence of contingent and personal causes in effecting the great revolutions of the world. The generals of Zingis[42], when they had conquered Persia, employed some of their prisoners as guides to conduct them to Derbent, a place of considerable strength on the western shore of the Caspian Sea, which they

[37] L'Evesque, tome i. pp. 294, 311. [38] Ibid., p. 293. [39] Constantinople was taken by the Latins or Franks of the first crusade in the year 1203. [40] Ibid., tome ii. p. 53. [41] Ibid., p. 54.
[42] Ibid., pp. 64, &c.

were desirous of possessing. If, says the historian of Russia, this project had been successful, the Tatars would perhaps never have thought of attacking the Russians, or rather they would never have known them. To insure the fidelity of their guides, they had employed the cruel precaution of putting one of them to death, threatening to treat the others with the same severity, if they should prove perfidious. These however, excited to vengeance by their barbarous conduct, led them away from Derbent into an ambuscade, prepared by a confederacy of two of the barbarous tribes[43], which bordered on the territory of Russia. The invaders, having contrived by negotiation to dissolve the confederacy, one of the tribes being of Tatar origin, entirely subdued the other, no longer supported by its ally; and this, alarmed at the danger, to which it was then itself exposed, sought assistance from the Russians, to which it had long been hostile. The Tatars sent ambassadors to the Russians, who had descended along the Dnieper to encounter them; the Russians, not contented with disregarding their representations, barbarously massacred their ambassadors; and the Tatars then resolved to wage war with these new enemies, with whom it had been found impossible to negotiate a peace.

The inveterate divisions of this nation were not suspended by a sense of common danger, and in the republic of Novgorod in particular the general calamity was even aggravated[44] by the scourges of nature, ungenial seasons, famine, and earthquake, so that in the moment of its most critical struggle[45] Russia languished in extreme weakness. How important this combination of favourable circumstances was to the success of its Tatar enemies, appears from the difficulty which they experienced in gaining possession of one city, so inconsiderable that its situation is now unknown. During seven weeks[46] did the inhabitants of this town set at defiance the utmost efforts of their enemies, and, when their walls had been at length levelled with the ground, they sallied forth against the assailants, and slew four thousand

[43] These were the Alans and the Kaptchaks. The Tatars, in destroying the former, extinguished a nation celebrated among those, which had contributed to the destruction of the Roman empire.—L'Evesque, tome i. pp. 65, 66. [44] Ibid., tome ii. p. 77. [45] Ibid., p. 78. [46] Ibid., p. 90.

men before they were themselves destroyed. Favoured however by the causes, which disabled the Russians generally for acting with the spirit of the people of Kozelsk, the Tatars were rapidly successful; and within twenty years from their first irruption, which occurred in the year 1223, the sovereign of Russia became the tributary vassal of these barbarians[47].

While the sovereign of the Mongol Tatars resided in Karacum, or Caracorum, a city of Chinese Tatary[48], the precise situation of which has not been ascertained, Russia became subject to a dependent tribe denominated Kaptchak, which occupied the country on the north-west side of the Caspian Sea, lying among the Don, the Volga, and the Jaik. Sarai, a town built soon after the conquest of Russia, and situated on the Volga, was the capital of this provincial government. To this capital, and sometimes even to that of the grand horde, were the Russian princes obliged to resort[49], that they might receive from their imperious masters the confirmation of their authority, and learn their pleasure in regard to the administration. The tribe of the Kaptchak, originally pagan, became Mohammedan[50] in the reign of Usbek, which was begun in the year 1313. Neither before however, nor after this change of religion, does it appear that the Christianity of the vanquished people was an object of persecution with the conquerors, but on the contrary the clergy were even particularly favoured[51], probably as the best instruments for securing the submission of the nation. The subjection of the Russians indeed, though severe and oppressive, could not have been marked with extreme humiliation, since in various instances[52] their princes were permitted to marry the daughters of the Tatarian khans.

[47] Well did they deserve the name, since in the triumphal banquet of their chief the benches were placed on the bodies of living captives, who, in disregard of a solemn promise of their lives, and of a permission to redeem their liberty, were thus stifled amidst the rejoicing of their inhuman conquerors.—L'Evesque, tome ii. p. 64. [48] This capital of the Mongolian power is placed by D'Anville, with a confession of uncertainty, on the river Onghin, while others suppose it to have been situated on the river Orchon, about one hundred and fifty British miles towards the north west.—Pinkerton's Mod. Geogr., vol. ii. p. 118.

[49] L'Evesque, tome ii. p. 124. [50] Ibid., p. 171. [51] Ibid., pp. 172, 173. [52] Ibid., pp. 174, 175.

As the Tatar domination had arisen from the ambition of Zingis-khan, so the agent, by whom it was chiefly overthrown[53], was Tamerlane, whose power influenced the fortunes of the world from Russia to Hindostan. Tamerlane had become master of Persia, when he was attacked by the khan of the Kaptchak. This adversary he after some struggle overthrew and deposed; and being led by his victory to the frontier of Russia, he entered that country, in the year 1395, at the head of four hundred thousand men. The Russian sovereign prepared to make some effort for the preservation of his country though apparently without any probability of success, when the invader unexpectedly withdrew his mighty host, for no other reason, as it seems, than that a conqueror must somewhere set a limit to his progress. Russia accordingly received no injury from this formidable host, while a mortal blow was inflicted upon the power of the horde, by which it had been long held in dependence.

The ascendency of the Tatars over the Russians, had indeed been previously undermined by the gradual operation of a cause similar to that, which had before prepared the latter for yielding to their dominion. The dissensions of the Tatars[54] had appeared so early as in the fourteenth year from the reduction of Russia, when their most valiant general, who had conquered the nations of the northern coast of the Black Sea, renounced his subjection to his sovereign. For a considerable time however these dissensions only increased the misery and weakness of Russia, as they furnished allies to the contending factions, by which it was distracted.

While Russia was subjected to the Tatars, the seat of government was transferred to that central position at Moscow[55], which it retained until Peter the Great erected a maritime capital on the shore of the Gulf of Finland. Kiof, as being not inconveniently situated in regard to Constantinople, the source of the early improvement of Russia, had been the most eligible seat of its government in the first

[53] L'Evesque, tome ii. pp. 265, &c.. [54] Ibid., pp. 131, 159.

[55] In the year 1328. Dmitri IV., who began his reign in the year 1362, and ended it in the year 1389, built the *kremlin* of stone for his residence, the name, which is Tatarian, signifying a fortress.—Ibid. pp. 198, 258.

period of its history. When it had begun to be harassed by the Tatars, first Volodimer, and after Tver, cities more northern than Moscow, were better suited to its circumstances. As the period approached, in which it was to emerge from its humiliation, and at the same time to acquire the consistency and energy of an independent state, a central position was best accommodated to its exigencies. When at length it was to be connected with the system, formed among the western governments of Europe, a western and maritime capital was obviously requisite to the support of its new relations. The position of the capitals of countries have generally been determined by some early circumstances of their history, and have then exercised a permanent and important influence on their subsequent fortunes, as the domestic contingencies of early life very frequently determine the character of the course of events, which constitute the history of an individual. But this great monarchy resembles a person thrown abroad into the world in the very commencement of his career, and taking from the changing circumstances, in which he is successively placed, the varying modifications of his disposition and conduct.

For a correspondence to the general changes of the history of this great government, we must look to those of the common fortunes of the southern nations of Europe, the principal government of the northern bearing in this respect an analogy to the whole of the southern system. The original improvement of the country may accordingly be compared to the refinement of the southern nations in the period preceding the subversion of the empire of the west; the domination of its Tatar masters may in the like manner be conceived to correspond to the ascendency obtained over the Roman provinces by the rude nations of Germany; and its restored independence, with the subsequent advancement of improvement in Russia, to that more improved policy, which has arisen out of the temporary barbarism of southern Europe. There is however this important peculiarity belonging to the Russian government, that the Tatars did not enter into a permanent combination with its people, as the Germans did with the subjects of Rome, but merely exercised over them a dominion, which after a time passed away, and left them to the management of their own interests.

The establishment of the Germans in the provinces of the Roman empire was a case, in which a new force was intimately compounded with the political agencies already existing in those provinces, and united with them in generating a common result; the dominion acquired by the Tatars over Russia was the case of an external power applied with violence for a time, and then entirely removed, without any mixture or communication. In the destruction of the Roman empire it was expedient that the northern invaders should be incorporated with the actual inhabitants, because the latter, in the decline of a great system of civilisation, had become so degenerate, as to require an infusion of the bold independence of more simple nations. Russia on the other hand had not been so civilised, as to suffer from the corruption of social refinement, and could therefore receive from the agency of less improved invaders only the benefit, which might arise from the shock given by it to ill-combined arrangements of policy.

That the influence of the domination of the Tatars was in this manner beneficial to the government of Russia, may be easily understood. That government, as it grew out of the commercial republic of Novgorod, was in its original formation destitute of the aristocratic order, which is necessary for the support of a monarchy in any degree approaching to the form of temperate royalty established generally in the countries of Christian Europe. The deficiency was indeed speedily supplied by a distribution of the territory among the numerous princes of the reigning family; but the dissensions of these petty sovereigns were inconsistent with the public order, and required the application of some external power, to reduce the new body of nobles to the necessary subordination. This power was the domination of the Tatars, the dissensions of the numerous princes of Russia[56] being carefully fomented by their Tatar rulers, and these dissensions[57], by exhausting and enfeebling the petty sovereigns of the provinces, rendering them less capable of resisting the control of the sovereign, while he was maintained on the throne as the vassal of the Tatars.

In these circumstances the ascendency of the royal power[58]

[56] L'Evesque, tome ii. pp. 145, 152. [57] Ibid., p. 219.
[58] Ibid., p. 230.

began to appear so early as in the year 1341, when Simeon, the sovereign, led against the republic of Novgorod the numerous princes, who just before had contested his right of succeeding to the throne. So rapidly did the aggrandisement of the royal power proceed, that it may be considered as sufficiently formed in the reign of Dmitri IV., who ascended the throne but twenty-one years later than the time, which has been mentioned for its indication. Even in the second year of his reign[59] he united two principalities to the crown, and within a very few years he received the homage of all the princes of Russia. A formidable irruption of the Tatars served to unite the princes more closely in subordination to their chiefs; a great victory, obtained over the invaders, gave to his authority the credit of successful vigour; and even the severe losses[60] sustained in the conflict by his followers, as they weakened the aristocracy, must have augmented his relative superiority.

The growing power of the Russian monarchy would in the course of time have become equal to that of its antagonist, which was in its turn enfeebled by domestic dissension[61]; but the crisis was accelerated by the interposition of Tamerlane, who coming from the central regions of Asia, struck the decisive blow at the domination of the Tatars. After a doubtful struggle he succeeded in deposing the khan of the Kaptchak, and establishing in his place another prince, who depended wholly on himself for support. From this time[62], the year 1395, the weakness of the Tatars continually increasing, a system of crafty policy was substituted for the imperious rule of a haughty superiority.

The time at length arrived, when the sovereign of Russia discovered that, to be free, he had only to renounce subjection. In no instance does the adaptation of personal qualities more obviously present itself to the student of history, than in the character of Ivan III., who in the year 1462, ascended the throne of Russia. Scarcely twenty-three years old when he took possession of the throne, he cast his views around him[63], anticipating his future greatness, and regarding those parts of Russia, which did not yet belong to him,

[59] L'Evesque, tome ii. pp. 239, 241. [60] Ibid., p. 247. [61] Ibid., p. 220. [62] Ibid., pp. 268, 278. [63] Ibid., p. 318.

as destined to augment his territory, he saw in the hordes of the Tatars, which seemed to menace him with hostility, only the object of his arms, and the occasion of his triumphs. Not only were the domains of various princes united to the crown[64], but also many considerable cities, which had been severed from the territory of Russia, were recovered; Novgorod in particular, that ancient republic, which had so long maintained a public independence even under the authority of the crown, was at length subjected, being then for the first time assailable in the summer[65]. Moscow then for the first time beheld ambassadors from the German emperor, the pope, the sultan of Constantinople, the kings of Poland and Denmark, and the republic of Venice: and the efforts of the monarch were exerted to attract into Russia some of those artists[66], who were beginning to restore in Italy the elegant embellishments of cultivated life, and one employed in preparing the formidable implements of modern hostility. The vigour of the government began even then to expand itself in the grand project of Russian ambition, for with this rescuer of the independence of his country commenced the scheme of acquiring the succession of the throne of Constantinople, this prince having, with this expectation, married the grand-daughter of the last of the Grecian emperors.

CHAPTER IX.

Of the history of Poland, from the year 964 *to the commencement of the reign of Sigismond I., in the year* 1507.

Miecislaus, or Mieszkri, king of Poland in the year 964—Casimir the Great king, 1333—The crown became elective, 1370—The Lithua-

[64] L'Evesque, tome ii. pp. 345, 353, 364. [65] In this year there had been no rain, and the marshes, by which it had been rendered impregnable in summer, were then dried by the extraordinary heat of the weather.—Ibid., pp. 326, 327. [66] The hope of reward drew from Italy architects, goldsmiths, founders of cannon, and masons, and some of the inventions of Greece embellished the capital of Russia. —Ibid., pp. 364, 365.

nian dynasty and union of Lithuania begun, 1386—The Teutonic knights reduced, 1466—Representative members in the national assembly, 1468—The incorporate union of Lithuania, 1501.

POLAND, in the several periods of its history, has borne a more various relation to the general system of Europe, than any other country. Its government first formed itself into consistency and strength under the protection of the exterior state of Russia; then in its turn it constituted a part of the protecting frontier of Christendom, opposed to the barbarians who continued to advance from the northern regions of Asia; afterwards in its decay it became a political waste, serving to separate the great southern system of governments from the new combination beginning to be formed in the north, and thus preventing a premature and prejudicial interference; and finally when a more general combination of national interests had become expedient and desirable, it gradually yielded to the power of the neighbouring nations, and by successive partitions brought them into an immediate proximity. The view taken in the present chapter will however comprehend only the first of these periods and a part of the second, as it will terminate at the commencement of the reign of Sigismond I., or in the year 1507, just before the constitution of Poland attained its most perfect form.

The original circumstances of Russia and Poland corresponded in several particulars. The population was in each country composed chiefly of Slavians; the territory of each was an extensive and open country, intersected by rivers; and, as Russia lay between the Baltic and the Greek capital, so was Poland[1] situated between the same sea and Italy, the most improved country of the west. The fortunes of

[1] Poland, in the first period of its history, was, according to Hartknoch, divided from Russia by the Vistula, and comprehended the provinces since named the Greater and Lesser Poland, with a part of Masovia, Silesia, and a territory which he has named the new *marche*. Hartknoch de Rep. Polon., p. 30. Lipsiæ, 1698. Rodericus, a writer of the twelfth century, has described Poland as bounded in his time by the Oder on the west, by the Vistula on the east, by the Ruthenii or Rugii and the Baltic on the north, and by the woods of the Bohemians on the south. But after the time of this writer the boundary of Poland was gradually advanced beyond the Vistula, especially by Casimir the Great.—Ibid., p. 73.

the two countries however have been in various important particulars, not only different, but directly contrasted. In Russia a simple despotism has been established on the ruins of a government, which had been formed out of the republican independence of Novgorod; whereas in Poland the royal power, originally almost unlimited, was gradually reduced to the mere presidency in a democracy of nobles. Russia sunk under the invasions of the Tatars, and remained subject to their dominion during a period exceeding two centuries; whereas Poland proved to be a firm bulwark of Christendom against the inroads, not only of the hordes of Tatary, but also of the Turks established in Greece. Russia, lastly, has at length risen from her long-continued humiliation and barbarism to the high rank of arbitress of the interests of Europe, while Poland, losing even her national existence, was first partitioned by states which she had either governed or protected, and then almost all engrossed by Russia as a united territory.

Though some of the causes of these very different results were personal and contingent, yet others were fixed in the circumstances of the two countries notwithstanding their general correspondence. Russia enjoyed a situation much more favourable to early improvement by possessing an easy communication with the Greek capital, in which was chiefly preserved whatever remained of the refinement and commerce of the ancient empire. That country was also subjected to the disadvantage of a more exposed situation in regard to the inroads of the Tatars, in encountering which it was by its position the advanced station of Europe. It was moreover by its exterior position secured from the ruin, which ultimately overwhelmed and destroyed Poland, not being, like that country, surrounded by greedy and unprincipled potentates, who might agree among themselves to share the plunder, to be afterwards monopolised by the most powerful.

Among the first notices of the early state of Russia, which have reached us, we find established laws, founded on principles of a wise and discriminating equity; and we are assured that, however imperfect the internal arrangement of the government may have been, the power of the sovereign was controlled by the states general of the nation[2]. It is on

[2] L'Evesque, tome i. pp. 201, 202.

the contrary affirmed by the historians of Poland[3], that the power of the earlier sovereigns of that country was not restrained, either by any assembly of states, or by any settled principles of policy, and that the influence acquired by the clergy, when the Christian religion had been introduced, furnished the first formal limitation of the royal authority. This difference is explained by the consideration, that Russia is described as abounding in towns from the most remote period of its history, a peculiarity probably resulting from the commerce, which was itself a result of the position of the country. Thus it was that, while Poland continued in barbarism, Russia was originally disposed to form itself into a regulated community, and was thereby enabled to constitute an exterior and primary rampart of the European system, which might restrain, or at least occupy, the eastern ravagers, until Poland should be qualified to assume the protection of Christendom.

The Slavian tribes, which appear to have possessed the countries on the eastern side of the Vistula before the sixth century, established themselves in the countries on the western side of that river about the end of the sixth, or the beginning of the seventh[4], the Goths having abandoned them in their progress into the more southern regions of Europe. To this period is referred Lecht or Lechus, the first prince of the Poles. But the whole of the first series of Polish sovereigns, beginning with Lecht, and ending at the accession of Piast[5], who began to reign in the year 842, is excluded from the authentic history of the country. Nor even at the termination of this series does the Polish history begin to assume the character of certainty. For this we must look more than a century forward to the reign of Miecislaus or Mieskri, which began in the year 964, the intercourse with other nations, occasioned by his adoption of the Christian religion[6], having then caused these to

[3] Hartknoch de Rep. Polon., pp. 335, 615, 616. [4] Ibid., pp. 12—14. Dissert. de Orig. Pomer., pp. 57, &c. [5] Hartknoch de Rep. Polon., p. 22.

[6] In the time of this prince, when the priest began the gospel in the celebration of divine service, the nobles drew their swords half way from the sheaths, and kept them in that position, until it was concluded, as if professing that they were ready to die (or rather, to fight) in defence of their religion.—Cromerus de Rep. Polon., p. 35. Basil, 1568.

introduce into their own histories some mention of the events, which occurred among the newly proselyted people.

Poland received from Germany the Latin form of Christianity, whereas Russia had derived from Constantinople the faith of the Grecian church. The influence of the Latin faith of Poland appears to have consisted partly in constituting a communication between its people and the western nations, from which it received its institutions, partly in maintaining a distinctness from the Slavian population of Russia, to an incorporation with which it might otherwise have prematurely tended.

The conversion of the Poles, while it gave a beginning to the authentic history of the country, was also the epoch of a temporary degradation. Miecislaus I.[7], the first Christian sovereign, having become the tributary of that empire, from which he had received the knowledge of Christianity. In what degree of subjection the Poles were then held by the Germans is not ascertained, nor is it known how they afterwards contrived to assert their independence, it being only conjectured[8], that they availed themselves of the opportunity afforded by the long period of disorder, in the thirteenth century, which preceded the advancement of Rodolph of Hapsburgh to the throne of the empire. That period of subjection, which probably continued through three centuries, must have favoured the introduction of the institutions and usages of Germany; nor did its influence cease with the recovery of independence, for the first considerable improvement of Poland[9] is referred to the reign of Casimir the Great, who freely assigned lands to all Germans willing to settle themselves in his country, and introduced[10] the German laws for the regulation of the towns, which they inhabited.

This distinguished prince ascended the throne of Poland in the year 1333, and held it during thirty-seven years. Russia having been reduced by the Tatars in the year 1243, it appears that the great improvement of Poland commenced ninety years later than the subjugation of the neighbouring country, and was coincident with its most abject humilia-

[7] Hartknoch de Rep. Polon., pp. 42, &c. [8] Ibid., p. 53. Rodolph was advanced to the throne in the year 1273. [9] Ibid., p. 72.
[10] Ibid., p. 362.

tion. From this observation we may conclude, that Poland must have been disqualified for this improvement, if Russia had not then been interposed, to receive the shock of the invasions of the Tatars.

To Russia these invasions were beneficial, as they served to consolidate a government, which, though very imperfect and irregular, consisted of various orders of men, and was administered according to established laws. To Poland they must have assured the doom of a protracted barbarity, because its government had not then acquired the materials, upon which their violence could have acted with advantage. How incapable the latter country would at that time have been of opposing a firm resistance to these fierce invaders, appears from the facility[11] with which it was overrun by them, when they were possessing themselves of the former. The Tatar empire however, which had been established by the successes of Zingis-khan, was from that time sufficiently occupied by the possession of Russia and by its own internal dissensions; and, when other barbarians endeavoured to penetrate into western Europe, the Polish government had acquired so much consistency and strength, as to become the firm bulwark of the civilisation of Christendom.

We should very inadequately conceive the efforts of the illustrious Casimir for the improvement of his country, if we should suppose that they were limited to the encouragement of enlightened Germans. One of his cares was to provide for the security of his kingdom[12] by acquiring from the neighbouring powers, either by arms or by negotiations, the provinces of Volhinia and Masovia, with other tracts, and thus procuring for it at once the strength of additional territory and the protection of a more distant frontier. His chief attention, however, he directed to the various means of internal improvement, building towns and fortresses, encouraging commerce, beginning a university[13], and giving to his

[11] In the year 1241 the Tatars ravaged the whole of Poland, and penetrated even to Silesia, where they are said to have gained a great victory. It is related that they filled nine very large sacks with the ears of the slain.—Hartknoch, p. 70. [12] Cromerus, pp. 208, 210. This historian has mentioned, besides Volhinia and Masovia, certain tracts which he named Belsensis and Brestensis. [13] It was completed by Jaghellon, who brought teachers from the university of Prague.—Hartknoch, p. 81.

subjects a code of laws so much superior to those already observed amongst them, that he has been considered as the earliest legislator of his country. These were the arts[14], by which this prince acquired the surname of the Great, the single example among princes, except Peter of Russia, of such a distinction conferred exclusively for attention given to the arts of peace. Casimir particularly laboured to ameliorate the condition of the peasants[15], and with this design manifested so much anxiety to protect them against the oppressions of the nobles, that he was by the latter contemptuously denominated the king of the rustics.

It happened indeed that he was induced by the circumstances, in which he was placed, to confer so many privileges on the nobles, that he may be regarded as the author of the aristocracy, which afterwards overpowered the monarchical part of the government, and prepared the ruin of the independence of Poland. Not having any hope of male posterity[16], he became solicitous to secure the succession for his nephew Louis king of Hungary, and for attaining this object found it necessary to gratify the nobles with so many concessions, that they date their privileges from his reign. Thus it happened that the same reign was the grand period of the improvement of the country, and remotely made preparation for its subsequent decay and final degradation. The function of Poland in the general system of Europe was, however, of a subordinate character, and might best be discharged by an imperfect and temporary government.

Though the crown thus became elective at the death of Casimir, which occurred in the year 1370, the election continued during two centuries to be limited to the same family, not being opened to princes of various families until the year 1572. This long interval of order was interposed between the establishment of the principle of election and the commencement of its unrestrained application, partly by the circumstances of the family of Louis, the first of the elected sovereigns, partly by the accession of the great duchy of Lithuania to the Polish kingdom. By the combined operation of these very distinct and dissimilar causes was the monarchy so long retained in a condition consistent with its

[14] Cromerus, p. 216. [15] Ibid., p. 211. [16] Hartknoch, p. 72.

actual vigour and prosperity, but preparing the causes of its subsequent imbecility and ultimate destruction.

Louis king of Hungary and Poland having, like his uncle Casimir, no male issue to succeed him, named to the succession the elder of his two daughters[17], and her husband Sigismond marquess of Brandenburg, obliging the nobles to swear that they would maintain the appointment. Instead, however, of being suffered to subsist, it just served to confirm the practice of electing the successor, though from the reigning family. Immediately after the death of Louis the appointment was set aside, and the younger daughter, who was not then married, was placed upon the throne. The Poles[18] had been offended and alienated by some particulars in the conduct of Sigismond, even while he was seeking to carry his appointment into execution; and as Sigismond claimed also the succession of Hungary, and they had in the reign of Louis experienced[19], that a Hungarian sovereign could not afford the necessary protection to their government, they were probably on this account also adverse to his claim of their own crown. The latter consideration points out the operation of the temporary connexion of Hungary and Poland under a common sovereign.

The advancement of the younger daughter was, four years afterwards, followed by her marriage with Jaghellon grand-duke of Lithuania, which in the year 1386[20] gave a beginning to the series of Lithuanian kings of Poland, and the important union of that considerable duchy. This marriage was an event productive of important effects, in regard both to the external security and to the internal order of the government. By widely extending towards Russia[21] the territory of the state, it added much to its strength on that side, on which it was most exposed to attack; and by placing on

[17] Cromerus, p. 229. [18] He had refused to remove an obnoxious governor of the Greater Poland; he had caused the Poles to retire when he began his dinner; and he had conferred on a Bohemian an ecclesiastical office in Poland contrary to the intreaty of the nobles.—Ibid., p. 230. [19] Ibid., p. 225. [20] This princess died in the year 1399, but the right of Jaghellon was sustained by a second marriage with a grand-daughter of Casimir the Great. [21] Lithuania had just then attained its greatest magnitude, being augmented by the addition of some Russian provinces, and of the Polish province of Podolia, and thus extended from the Baltic to the Black Sea. In the year 1478 it began to decrease.—Hartknoch, pp. 199, 200.

the throne a family regarded with jealousy by the Poles, it preserved the principle of an elective monarchy while the succession was practically hereditary. The importance of Lithuania maintained the succession of the family of Jaghellon, but the jealousy of the Poles[22] appears to have hindered them from acquiescing in that succession as a right, and to have caused them to insist on ratifying it in each instance by an election. This practice was continued until the year 1572, when the male line of the family of Jaghellon became extinct, and the crown became simply elective, the kings being thenceforward chosen from various families and countries.

The beginning of the privileges of the nobles of Poland[23] is referred to the introduction of the Christian religion, which occurred in the latter part of the tenth century, the bishops having then obtained various immunities through their influence over the minds of their sovereign, and having thus set the example of limiting an authority, which before that time had been wholly indefinite. A connexion being at the same time formed with Germany, the influence of German usages must have stimulated the rude chieftains of the Poles to aspire to the enjoyment of the rights of German nobles; and, as the invasions of foreign enemies furnished the nobles with opportunities of acquiring claims to the gratitude of their sovereign, so did the civil commotions, by which in this period the government was agitated, afford fit occasions for wresting from the crown a variety of concessions. When these causes had gradually, through a period of four centuries, prepared and formed an aristocracy, the change of the government from an hereditary to an elective monarchy was most favourable to its aggrandisement, the nobles being thus enabled to bestow the crown on each demise of the sovereign, and new concessions of privileges being the price, which every candidate was necessitated to undertake to pay. As however the elective principle of the government, though for-

[22] That the right of election was claimed and exercised appears in two instances, in which the reigning prince procured his son to be in his own life-time nominated his successor, especially as it was on each occasion stipulated, that the example should not be considered as derogating from that right; and it is yet more distinctly proved by the resolution afterwards formed, that such an appointment should not again be permitted, lest the freedom of election should be infringed.—Hartknoch, p. 228.

[23] Ibid., pp. 335—337.

mally maintained, was not for a long time reduced to practice in its entire extent, the aggrandisement of the aristocracy was in that interval proportionally slow; nor was it until the Lithuanian family had become extinct, that the election of a foreign prince, Henry son of Henry II. of France, gave occasion to those written stipulations[24] between the sovereign and the nobles, which are known by the denomination of *pacta conventa.*

The reign of Louis, the common sovereign of Hungary and Poland, may, as has been intimated, be regarded as creating a repulsion between these two neighbouring kingdoms, which served to alienate the latter from an intimate connexion with the former, and to leave this other kingdom at liberty to connect itself with the empire of Germany. One part of this operation has been already noticed; the influence of the other became speedily apparent. The death of Louis occurred in the year 1385, and Sigismond of Hungary was advanced to the throne of the empire in the year 1410, or twenty-five years after that the Poles had excluded him from the throne of their kingdom. Nature indeed had, in the chain of the Carpathian mountains, interposed a dividing frontier between Poland and Hungary; but this frontier was much strengthened by political alienation, and Hungary was by both together irresistibly determined to its proper combination in the system of Europe. A convention had been actually concluded between the Poles and the Hungarians, by which it was agreed that[25], if either of the two sisters should die without leaving issue, the other should succeed to her kingdom; but, though the queen of Hungary left no children, the king of Poland attempted in vain to enforce his pretension, and was compelled to abandon that kingdom to Sigismond.

The union of Lithuania was in every respect different from

[24] In these the king declared first how he would act in exercising the powers of the crown, as in making war, concluding peace, appointing magistrates, and coining money; then he determined certain other matters important to the public interests, as his marriage, the management of the possessions of the crown, the building of castles, and others of the like nature; and lastly, he sometimes promised to fulfil certain special conditions, as that his kindred should not be raised above the other nobles, or that he should recover a province, which had been conquered by the enemy.—Hartknoch, p. 338. [25] Cromerus, p. 234.

the casual and temporary connexion formed with Hungary. This great territory was not separated from Poland by any natural barrier; was situated on that side of it, on which a covering frontier was most necessary for its security; and, being remote from the countries of the southern system of Europe, was not fitted, like Hungary, to enter into a connexion with any of the states, of which that system was to be composed. In this union too the Poles were enabled to guard themselves against the inconvenience, which they had recently experienced in their connexion with Hungary. The superior importance of the country, to which they received the Lithuanian prince, gave them an advantage in the negotiation, by which they could stipulate[26] for the future residence of their new sovereign within their part of the united territory.

The conversion of Jaghellon and the Lithuanians was also a condition[27], as it was a consequence of the union. The prince himself, having been the son of a Christian mother, was not unprepared to accede to the demand, that he should embrace the religion of his queen; and his subjects, though then so barbarously pagan, that they even sacrificed a prisoner when they returned from a war, were yet contented to follow his example, when they beheld, without witnessing any manifestation of the divine vengeance, their sacred fire extinguished, their temple with its shrine and altar demolished, their venerated serpents killed, and their holy groves laid prostrate on the earth.

The marriage of the archduke of Lithuania with the queen of Poland, and the stipulated union of the duchy with the kingdom, were effected in the year 1386; and the importance of the augmentation of the national strength, which was the result of the treaty, soon became conspicuous in the violent struggle, which the government maintained with the Teutonic knights, then possesssing Prussia and the neighbouring provinces.

Prussia[28], originally occupied by Slavians, and afterwards possessed by Goths or Germans, was in the beginning of the eleventh century subdued by the king of Poland; it was a second time reduced in the latter part of the same

[26] Cromerus, pp. 233, 240. [27] Ibid., pp. 239—243. [28] Hartknoch, pp. 6, 154, &c.

century, and a third time in the beginning of the twelfth. A subsequent insurrection determined the Polish king, in the thirteenth century, to cede the country to the Teutonic knights, whose order[29], like those of the Hospitallers and the Templars, had been founded in Asia, but was removed to Europe, when the crusaders were forced to relinquish the hope of recovering Palestine from the infidels. These knights, when in a struggle of fifty-three years they had subdued the Prussians, became in their turn not less hostile to the Poles. Jaghellon led against the knights[30] the whole force of his kingdom, and gained considerable advantages. Their reduction was not however effected until the year 1466, when the Prussians[31], oppressed by their tyranny, had solicited the protection of Poland. When more than three hundred and fifty thousand men had perished in the fierce and desperate struggle, the knights[32] yielded to the Poles the territories of Culm, Michlow, and Pomerania, with a part of Prussia; and it was agreed, that their grand master should perform homage to the king for that part of Prussia, which he was permitted to retain, and have a seat in the senate of Poland.

The war of Prussia was instrumental to the interior arrangement of the Polish state. A senate or council[33], composed it seems of twelve palatines, had probably existed from the early times of the government, though with little or no practical influence on the government. This was afterwards enlarged and rendered considerable by the admission of the bishops, when the Christian religion had been embraced in the time of Miecislaus; but representative members were not yet associated with the nobles and the prelates, because no urgent necessity had existed for creating such an organ of the public sentiment. The expenses however incurred in the war of Prussia demanded supplies so considerable, that it was at length judged expedient to

[29] Pfeffel, tome i. pp. 309, 342, 350. [30] These had in the year 1237 incorporated with themselves another order of knights, which had been recently created for enforcing the conversion of the Livonians, and thereby in a short time acquired also the provinces of Livonia and Esthonia. [31] Pfeffel, tome ii. p. 30. [32] Cromerus, p. 387.

[33] Hartknoch, lib. ii. cap. iii. A palatine was in the language of Poland denominated *woiwoda*, a name apparently derived from the two words *woina* and *wodz*, which signify *war* and *leader*.—Ibid., p. 31.

provide them by a common deliberation, instead of furnishing them separately in the several provinces of the kingdom, which at this time was widely extended. When the third sovereign[34] of the Lithuanian dynasty, in the year 1468, solicited the nobles of the Lesser Poland[35], to enable him to defray the expenses of the war, they required to have an opportunity of acting in concert with those of the Greater Poland, and that two deputies should for this purpose be sent from every palatinate to Peterkaw. When the beginning had been thus made, the practice was adopted by the other provinces[36], though with much variety in the number of the deputies, especially in Polish Prussia. The ordinary number of deputies was one hundred and seventy-four, exclusively of those of Prussia, whose number was uncertain.

Cromer, who published his valuable history of his country in the year 1566, has strongly expressed his apprehension of the tendency of this innovation in the government, which he compared to the establishment of the tribunes of Rome, and of the ephori of Sparta. It may well be conceived that an institution, which in a sound organization of government would have been a principle of salutary freedom, should in the irregular constitution of Poland even then have amply justified the fears, with which he regarded it as a principle of anarchy and ruin.

Nor was this war destitute of a relation to the general interests of Europe. The germ of the Prussian government appears to have been early formed by the Teutonic knights, in that military spirit which has been retained by Prussia even to our own age. The time however was yet distant, in which the existence of a Prussian monarchy could be required for counterpoising Austria in the complex combination of the German empire. The growth of that government appears accordingly to have been restrained by the superior power of Poland during all that long period, in which it would have but obstructed the first development

[34] Cromerus, p. 394. [35] The territory of the crown of Poland was divided into these provinces; the Greater Poland, the Lesser Poland, Lithuania, Masovia, Prussia, Samogitia, White Russia, Red Russia, and the southern part of Livonia.—Hartknoch, p. 216.

[36] Ibid., pp. 652, &c.

of the federative relations of the general system. Its full expansion was afterwards permitted, when these relations had been constituted, and the independent power of Prussia might consist with the general arrangements of Europe.

Brandenburg, the electorate of which was at length transformed into the kingdom of Prussia, was originally, like that country, occupied by Slavians[37]. In the beginning of the tenth century the city was built by those tribes, as a barrier against the power of the Germans; but about the year 930 it was taken by the German emperor, on which occasion the territory was constituted a margravate, as it was a frontier-country exposed to the incursions of the Poles. The margravate was afterwards enlarged by the addition of some districts, which were torn from the Polish kingdom. The Teutonic order, becoming impatient of the ascendency of Poland, resolved to elect such chiefs, as should be able to protect them; and the result was, after a variety of changes, that connexion with Brandenburg[38], which at length gave being to the modern kingdom of Prussia.

The union of Lithuania with Poland[39] required a considerable time for its entire accomplishment. The Lithuanians were naturally jealous of a connexion formed with a country more powerful than their own, as they could not but feel, that they had sunk from independence to the subordinate condition of a province; and the Poles on the other hand, who had received from the Lithuanians the reigning family of their princes, were offended by every indication of preference, which these might happen to manifest for their original country. Various contentions accordingly arose between the united nations; and so violent was the animosity of the Lithuanians, that they were charged with having sometimes invited the Tatars to ravage the lands of their fellow-subjects. The union was at length in the year 1492

[37] Hartknoch, pp. 125, &c. [38] In the year 1525 that part of Prussia, which had been left to the Teutonic knights, was by a treaty concluded with the Poles erected into a secular and sovereign duchy, in favour of the margrave of Brandenburg, then the grand master of the order.—Pfeffel, tome ii. pp. 131—133. [39] So difficult was this union esteemed, that the wisest senators were accustomed to say, that they would suffer a halter to be thrown round their necks, when it should have been effected. To this they added, as another event entirely hopeless, that the laws should be executed. Hartknoch, p. 197.

actually dissolved, when it had subsisted a hundred and six years, the Lithuanians having at the death of Casimir IV. chosen as their duke[40] his son Alexander, and another son, John Albert, having been at the same time elected king of Poland. This interruption of the union, which continued nine years, was however preparatory to its more perfect establishment. At the death of John Albert, the Poles[41], who had felt the inconvenience of the separation, consented that his brother, the duke of Lithuania, should be advanced to their throne on the condition of forming a more intimate union of the two countries, than that which had been before stipulated. It was accordingly agreed that they should have but one national assembly, and that for the election of a king this assembly should be convened in Poland. But so difficult was it to effect an entire incorporation, that this measure was not finally completed until the year 1569, nearly two centuries after the commencement of the union. Then indeed, the reigning sovereign being the last male successor of the family of Jaghellon, and no hope being entertained of a continuation of the race, it was perceived to be absolutely necessary that measures of precaution should be employed for precluding the separation, which seemed to be approaching, and the two nations were accordingly in all respects united.

Hungary, which has been described as repelled from forming a connexion with Poland, formed with it notwithstanding, in the year 1440, a second temporary union, when the second of the Lithuanian sovereigns[42] of the latter country was invited to assume the government of the former, that he might defend it against the Turks, to whose formidably growing power it was continually exposed. This connexion was however dissolved as soon as the emergency had passed away; and both in the union, and in the subsequent separation, we perceive a curious operation of contingent

[40] When Jaghellon, who had been sovereign duke of Lithuania, became king of Poland, he constituted his brother great duke of that province, and after him some others. After the death of Jaghellon the Lithuanians chose their own great dukes until the year 1529, when the son of Sigismond the king was chosen. From this time the dignity was united to the crown, the young prince having been also declared king of Poland.—Gotfridi Lengnich. Jus. Publ. Regn. Pol., tome i. p. 30. Gedani, 1742. [41] Cromerus, p. 439. [42] Ibid., pp. 317, 318.

agency. The widow of the sovereign of Hungary was pregnant at the time of his death; but, as the child might not prove to be a male, and as, even if this had not been doubtful, the perilous situation of the country would not admit the government of an infant, the Hungarians tendered to the king of Poland the crown of their country with the hand of their queen. The child afterwards proved to be a prince, and naturally became the object of a party, which after four years placed him on the throne of Hungary, when their Polish sovereign had perished in an engagement with the Turks. The Poles on the other hand elected the brother of their late sovereign, and the connexion of the two kingdoms was at an end.

Silesia, or at least a considerable part of it, appears to have been subject to the earlier kings of Poland[43], as it was also originally occupied by Slavian tribes. In the twelfth century however the German emperor, having taken part in the dissensions of the royal family of Poland, obliged the king to grant this territory as a duchy to one of his brothers and his posterity. Hence began a gradual alienation of the territory from Poland, accelerated by the increasing influence of the Germans, until at length, in the fourteenth century, it became a German principality.

Moldavia and Walachia[44] submitted to the Poles towards the end of the fourteenth century. About the middle of the fifteenth the Turks became formidable neighbours and the inhabitants of these countries wavered in their submission between the two governments. In a later period the Turkish power gained the ascendency, and they became provinces of the Ottoman empire. These two countries thus appear to have been long a frontier of the Christian states; they were indeed in this respect deemed so important by the greatest of the Polish princes, Sigismond I., that he was on that account unwilling to proceed to any extremity in punishing them for their frequent infractions of treaties. When this frontier at length fell into the possession of the enemy, the loss also was conducive to the advantage of Christendom, as it was an exciting cause of those extraordinary efforts, by which the Polish Sobieski, in the year

[43] Hartknoch, pp. 105, &c. [44] Ibid., pp. 210, &c.

1683, crushed the power of the Turks under the walls of Vienna.

The assaults, which the modern system of Europe has sustained from the nations of Tatary, may be distinguished into three series. The first of these would comprehend those which were made by the dynasty begun by Zingis-khan in the year 1202; the second those made by the dynasty begun by Tamerlane in the year 1370; and the third those of the Turkish empire, established at Constantinople in the year 1453. These successive series of assaults were chiefly received by distinct nations of the Christians. As the early government of Russia constituted an exterior barrier, stretching from the Baltic almost to the Black Sea, it necessarily received the principal shocks of the former of the two Tatarian dynasties, though a part of them was also extended into Poland. These shocks it long sustained, and, when it at length gave way, it formed a spoil sufficiently considerable and attractive to divert the principal attention of the conquerors from the nation, which it had protected. The Tatars of the other dynasty, the founder of which had inflicted a deadly blow upon the Tatar dominion of Russia, appear to have directed more of their efforts against Poland, especially Podolia, the province most exposed; and the princes of the Lithuanian dynasty of Poland were accordingly engaged in frequent struggles with these barbarians. The Turks, possessing a more southern country, directed their hostilities against states of a less northerly situation, and Hungary in this period became the debatable territory. Though the Poles were not the advanced party in this struggle, they formed a most useful and necessary body of reserve for the support of the Hungarians. As the power of the Turks increased, even Germany was indebted to Poland for protection, the capital of the empire having, towards the close of the seventeenth century, been rescued from impending destruction by a Polish army. This appears to have been the peculiar function of the government of Poland, which accordingly sunk rapidly into anarchy and weakness, as soon as it had been fully and finally discharged.

CHAPTER X.

Of the histories of Denmark, Sweden, and Norway, in the period preceding the dissolution of the Union of Calmar in the year 1524.

Danish invasions of Ireland begun in the year 798—Danish invasions of England, 832—Connected history of Denmark, 840—Danes established in Ireland, 845—Connected history of Norway, 885—Rolfr, or Rollo, and his Norwegians, settled in France, 911—Norway conquered by Denmark, 950—Danes reduced in Ireland, 1014—Danes established in England, 1017—Norway independent, and beginning of the connected history of Sweden, 1035—England abandoned by the Danes, and Denmark and Norway united, 1042—Norway again separated, 1047—Improvement of Sweden, 1054—interrupted, 1138—Improvement of Sweden renewed, 1279—interrupted, 1303—Union of Calmar, 1397—Union finally dissolved, 1524.

DENMARK together with the Scandinavian peninsula has constituted an important organ in the combinations of Europe, though the local circumstances of these countries have incapacitated them for becoming a principal member. Remote in situation, and inferior in climate and soil, they could not, especially the Scandinavian peninsula, which included Sweden and Norway, acquire a preponderance of population and opulence; but their hardy inhabitants, excited to their utmost energy of exertion at once by the difficulties, to which they were subjected, and by the almost universal opportunity of maritime enterprise, possessed all the power belonging to superior activity.

The population of these countries was chiefly received[1] from that earlier migration of the Germans, which preceded the migration of the Slavian tribes. Odin[2], whom the his-

[1] The northern migrations have been distinguished into three classes, those of the Celts, those of the Gothic or Teutonic tribes, and lastly those of the Slavians. The Celts appear to have first come into the countries of the west, and to have been the ancestors of the Gauls, Britons, and Irish. The Iberians, or the original Spaniards, appear to have been a distinct people, and the Celtiberians to have been formed by an intermixture of these with the Celts.—Bishop Percy's Northern Antiquities, pref. Lond., 1770. [2] Odin, or Woden, was the name of the god, whose prophet, or priest, this leader pretended to be; and the ignorance of succeeding ages so confounded the deity

torian of the Roman empire has aptly characterised as the Mohammed of the north, is supposed to have led his followers from the country lying between the Euxine and the Caspian seas into the north-western regions of Europe, about seventy years before the Christian era, when he had vainly endeavoured to support Mithridates against Rome, and was forced by Pompey to seek safety in flight. That the Goths were early established in Sweden there is sufficient evidence, for from the ninth to the twelfth century[3] the Goths and Swedes composed two distinct, and sometimes hostile members, of the same monarchy, and a large district of Sweden is still divided into East and West Gothland. To these north-western countries the tide of German migration appears first to have flowed, and then to have turned against the western empire, when the barriers, by which it had been restrained, had become too feeble to support its pressure.

Montesquieu[4] has given to Scandinavia in particular the

with the priest, that it is now impossible to distinguish them. The Icelandic chronicles describe him as the most persuasive of men, and say that he invented the Runic characters, and first taught poetry to the Scandinavians. They also represent him as the most furious and formidable enemy, and ascribe to him a skill in magic, which appears to have caused him to be considered as a god. All this implies only that he was much superior in civilisation to the rude inhabitants of the countries, which he invaded.—Hist. de Dannemarc, par Mallet, introd. ch. 4. Geneve, 1787, 1788. Some trace of the worship paid to Odin is still preserved in the name of the fourth day of the week, the day of Woden or Odin. As he was esteemed the author of magic, and inventor of all the arts, he was considered as corresponding to the Roman Mercury, and therefore the name of the day consecrated to him was in Latin *dies Mercurii*.—Ibid., ch. vi. The Edda, which contains all that is known of his religion, is in truth not a system of doctrine, but a course of poetical lectures, composed for the use of those young Icelanders, who wished to devote themselves to the profession of *scald*, or poet, it being thought necessary that they should retain in their poems the old mythology, though the pagan religion had been then recently abolished in Iceland. The name is derived from a Gothic word signifying *grandmother*, probably thought expressive of an ancient tradition. There have been two Eddas. The first was compiled by Sœmund Sigfusson; born in Iceland about the year 1057. This having been very voluminous and obscure, a second, which we now have, was composed by Snorro Sturleson, born in the year 1179.—Avant-Propos à seconde part de l'Introd. a l'Hist. de Dannemarc.

[3] Decline and Fall, &c., vol. i. p. 293. [4] Esprit des Lois., liv. xvii. ch. v.

characteristic title of the workshop of the liberty of Europe, remarking that from this country issued those valiant nations, who taught the world that nature had made men equal, and that they could not reasonably be dependent on others for their own happiness. If these countries had only formed a reservoir, from which the stream of liberty might most conveniently be poured upon the exhausted regions of the south, to restore the decayed vigour of the human character, such a function would have sufficiently justified their importance to the general system, and accounted for the peculiarities of their situation and conformation. But this consideration is very far from exhibiting the whole of the relations subsisting between the other countries of Europe and the three, which are the subject of the present chapter. These have been numerous and various; they have been continued through the entire period of modern history; and in the changing modifications of the general system they have accommodated themselves to successive exigencies, assuming in more recent times a character wholly different from that, which they had originally borne.

In looking for analogies among the combinations of states we discover a remarkable correspondence between that of the three governments at present considered, and that of the states composing the southern and principal system of Europe. The three northern countries, having from the earliest times been generally independent, were at length by the union of Calmar connected under a common government, and from the dissolution of this union all the more modern relations of these countries appear to have arisen. The union of Calmar, which, though with some interruption, subsisted from the year 1397 to the year 1524, appears thus to have been to these countries that, which the empire of Charlemagne was to the western provinces of the ancient empire, and the preceding period to have corresponded to the interval of time, which was interposed between the subversion of the Roman empire in the fifth century, and the establishment of the new empire by the French monarch at the close of the eighth. The time, which elapsed between our first notice of the three northern nations and the union of Calmar, was indeed much longer than that which intervened between the subversion of the western empire and

the commencement of the imperial dignity of Charlemagne, the former being an interval of six hundred, the latter an interval of three hundred and twenty-four years; but the northern nations, proceeding from absolute barbarism to civilisation, required a much longer period of time for their progress, than the provincials of a ruined empire, who had still among them the remnants of their former improvement.

The first agency of these northern nations on the southern states arose from the barbarism of their original condition, which, rendering them incapable of finding subsistence and occupation in their own countries, drove them to seek settlements in Ireland, England, and France. These enterprises however, though prompted by the same motives, had results as different as the circumstances of the countries, which were their objects. The invasions of Ireland[5], which were begun in the year 798, procured for the Danes, at the end of forty-seven years, a firm establishment in the country, which they retained until the year 1014, when they were driven from it by the memorable defeat sustained at Clontarf. Those of England, which were begun in the year 832, ended in placing the Danish king on the throne about three years after his people had been expelled from Ireland, which throne however was quietly relinquished at the expiration of the short period of twenty-five years. That of France[6], which was effected in the year 911, gave being to a permanent settlement, which, after a hundred and fifty-five years, was able to achieve a lasting acquisition of the neighbouring kingdom of England, abandoned by the Danes as untenable but twenty-four years before that enterprise. They were yet more various in respect to the remoter effects produced in the invaded countries. The Danish invasions of Ireland, while they drove away the literature, which had there found shelter, to the continent then prepared for its reception, served also to break down the native government of Ireland, and prepare it for submitting to the feeble efforts of conquest afterwards exerted by the government of

[5] See book i. ch. xxiii., note 12. [6] Rolfr, or Rollo, who was expelled from Norway in the year 896, sought a retreat first in the Hæbudæ or Hebrides, then in England, and finally established himself in France.—Antiq. Celto-Scand., p. 7. Havniæ, 1786. Turner's Hist. of the Anglo-Saxons, vol. iii. p. 94.

England. The Danish invasions of England served on the contrary to complete the consolidation of the English monarchy, in which the northern kingdoms of the Saxons had been but imperfectly united with the rest; and at the same time gave the impulse to the first formation of an English navy, which had been neglected by the Saxons, and infused a new portion of energy into the national character, which had been relaxed in the indolence of a successful establishment. The enterprise of Rollo, which transformed the French province of Neustria into the Norwegian principality of Normandy, provided, lastly, the instrument, which at once effected an important revolution in the government of England, and gave a beginning to that series of international relations, in which the two great governments of France and England have been since that time involved.

The invasions, both of Ireland and England, were begun before the commencement of the connected histories of the three northern countries. Mallet, the historian of Denmark, has placed the commencement of the connected history of that country at the year 840, in which began the reign of Gormon, whom however he calls the twenty-second king; Johnstone, who collected his Celto-Scandic Antiquities[7] from the writers of Iceland, has begun his annals of Norway with the reign of Harold in the year 885; and Puffendorf, though he began his history of Sweden at the arrival of Odin, did not venture to assign the times of the commencements of the several reigns before the year 1035. The interval, it may be remarked, between the last of these epochs and the union of Calmar does not much exceed the interval between the subversion of the empire of Rome and the commencement of the imperial dignity of Charlemagne.

[7] The inhabitants of that island, probably induced by an ungenial climate and much leisure to have recourse to such occupation, while they were stimulated to activity by a republican government, were particularly fond of history, and among them were formed those poets, who were named *scalds*. The first Icelandic historian, bishop Isleif, died in the year 1080. His collections are lost, but there is reason for believing that Are, a priest, used them in composing his Chronicles, a part of which is still extant. This writer lived towards the end of the same century, as did also Rœmund, some of whose works still remain. Snorro Sturleson, who was slain in the year 1241, is he of all their historians, whose works are most useful to us at present.—Bishop Percy's Northern Antiq. vol. i. pp. 44, &c.

The geographical circumstances of these countries appear to have influenced very decisively the characters and fortunes of the three nations. The territory of Denmark, composed of a peninsula much indented by the sea, and of several adjacent islands, was at once adapted to form such connexions with the southern governments, as might introduce into these northern regions the improvements of civilised society, and also to become the commercial country of the northern Mediterranean. Sweden, though not excluded from the Baltic, yet unfavourably circumstanced for commanding its entrance, and destitute of the advantage of insular possessions, was disposed to be military, rather than commercial; and, separated as it was from Germany, could receive its improvement only from Denmark, which was enabled to communicate it by possessing until the year 1658[8], except during one interval of thirty years, the three Scandinavian provinces of Schonen or Scania, Halland and Blecking. Norway lastly, being too inconsiderable in resources to maintain an independent existence, and separated from Sweden by a natural boundary of mountains, while its coast reaches to the vicinity of Denmark, was naturally urged to connect itself with the latter, especially as being more capable of furnishing a supply of provisions, and thus at once to augment the commercial resources of Denmark, and to complete its command of the Baltic.

The historian of Denmark[9] has given an interesting view of the extraordinary alternations of the fortunes of that country. This monarchy, says he, from which went forth the conquerors of the southern states, appears to have been exhausted by the effort, and to have fallen back into barbarism and obscurity; it afterwards resumed its vigour, and extended its sway over England; it then became enfeebled by violent disorders, occasioned by injudicious partitions of government; from this second relapse it again recovered, attained to an unhoped prosperity, and considerably advanced

[8] This province having been much oppressed by heavy imposts, revolted to Sweden in the year 1329, but was restored to Denmark, in the year 1359, with the two others, of which the king of Sweden had also become possessed. The peace of the year 1658, while it ceded these provinces to Sweden, allowed also the free passage of the Sound. —Hist. de Suede par Puffend., tome i. pp. 131, 138; tome iii. p. 23. Amst. 1732.

[9] Mallet, tome v. pp. 5, &c.

its frontier on the side of Germany; a revolution as unexpected then precipitated it into an almost total destruction; another restoration prepared it for its highest aggrandisement in the triple union of the kingdoms of the north; and the immediate successor of the illustrious female, who had accomplished this union, prepared the causes of the dissensions, by which it was ultimately destroyed, and Denmark reduced to its connexion with Norway. Denmark, like the two Sicilies, was not a principal member of the general system of Europe, and appears, like the Sicilies, to have had a varying fortune accommodated to the interests of other states.

Gormon[10], who about the year 840, had succeeded in establishing his authority over all the provinces of Denmark, which had before been almost continually divided by two or more princes, employed a reign of extraordinary length in consolidating his government. His successor, Harold II., effected in the year 950 the conquest of Norway, thus externally aggrandising his country. The bearing of this aggrandisement has been remarked by the historian[11], who has observed that it contributed not a little to the conquest of England, which the Danes not long afterwards effected, supplying them with a considerable augmentation of their forces, and with ports convenient for their expeditions. The Danes had long before possessed themselves of some provinces of England, and ravaged the others with an impunity, which could not fail to excite them to more considerable enterprises. Sweyne I., who succeeded Harold, accordingly achieved the conquest, for which preparation had thus been made. In the reign of his father he had formed a powerful party, and, being impatient to acquire possession of the crown, had engaged in an open revolt. After his accession it became his policy, not less than his inclination, to give employment to the forces, which he had collected to support his rebellion, and the situation of England, exposed by the imbecility of king Ethelred, surnamed the *Unready*, invited the attack of an enemy.

The conquest of England was effected by Sweyne in the year 1014; but, as he died at the expiration of a year from that event, and the Saxon Ethelred was then reinstated in

[10] Mallet, tome iii. pp. 45, 46. [11] Ibid., pp. 57, 77.

his authority, the Danish government of England did not regularly commence until the year 1017, in which Canute took possession of the throne. It was terminated by the accession of Edward the Confessor in the year 1041, when it had subsisted twenty-four years. Of this period of twenty-four years eighteen were occupied by the vigorous reign of Canute, who not only maintained his authority over his two kingdoms of Denmark and England, but also in the year 1026 effected a second time the reduction of Norway.

The temporary possession of England could not fail to exercise some considerable influence on its conquerors, and the personal character of Canute appears to have been well fitted to render that influence beneficial. The Danish historians accordingly[12] represent this prince as an enlightened improver of his original country, who eagerly availed himself of the advantage afforded to him by the acquisition of another, which had made some progress in civilisation. The Christian religion, which had been imperfectly introduced from France[13], became in the time of Canute the religion of the country, the greater part of the ecclesiastical preferments being given to English; the same prince caused a code of laws to be composed in England for his native country, and therefore probably adopted many parts of the jurisprudence of that which his family had acquired; and as in his coins, the first struck in Denmark, English words are found mixed

[12] Mallet, tome iii. pp. 137, 150, 157.

[13] In the reign of Sigefroy, who sent ambassadors to Charlemagne in the year 782, several missionaries proceeded to Denmark, at the suggestion of Wittikind, a Saxon prince recently converted. The results of these efforts are not known: but Harold, having been driven from the throne, sought refuge in the court of Louis the *debonnair*, and having been baptised with his family and a great number of Danish lords in the year 826, was sent back by Louis with troops and some missionaries, among which latter was Anschaire, who has been distinguished as the apostle of the north. Harold having been soon driven out, Anschaire did not make much progress in Denmark, but he was well received in Sweden. When however that prince was restored in the year 935, Christianity was again openly favoured. The conversion of Norway, effected towards the end of the tenth century, was military, and had its origin from England. Olaus Tryggueson, having been proselyted in England, when like Harold he had been driven from his throne, determined after his restoration that his subjects should embrace his religion, and, without employing any missionary to explain its doctrines, required and enforced the acceptance of it in a single campaign.—Mallet, tome iii. pp. 96, &c.

with the Danish, we may conclude that the artists had been brought thither from England.

Immediately after the death of Canute everything tended to separate England from Denmark, and to reduce the power of the latter. The temporary connexion of the two countries had operated beneficially on both, but must have been prejudicial, if longer continued. It was therefore desirable that the union should be dissolved as soon as possible after the death of the able prince, who had exerted his utmost efforts for the good government of both kingdoms.

It was not however sufficient that they should be simply disjoined, for it appears to have been on another account expedient that Denmark, which had been so powerful and so distinguished, should from that time sink for a long period into weakness and humiliation. To form the system of the north it was necessary that Sweden should then acquire strength and stability, and this could be effected only during the weakness of that neighbouring state, which had been hitherto predominant. The power of Denmark had been instrumental to the improvement of England; her weakness then favoured the improvement of Sweden.

Sweden, it has been remarked, begins her connected history at the year 1035, the same year in which Canute the Great died; and the improvement of that country [14] is represented to have been begun in the year 1054, or nineteen years after the death of that prince, as if he had been removed to allow it freedom. That improvement is said to have been continued to the year 1138, or during eighty-four years, the five reigns, which occupied this interval, being described as constituting the golden age of Sweden. As the commencement of Swedish improvement followed at the short distance of nineteen years the commencement of the decline of Denmark, so, it is remarkable, did its termination precede by precisely the same number of years the commencement of the restoration of that country, Denmark having begun in the year 1157 to assert her predominance in the north.

The history of Denmark from the death of Canute exhibits during a hundred and twenty-two years, with one short interruption, a series of misfortunes and humiliation, terminated

[14] Puffendorff, tome i. p. 80.

at the death of Sweyne III. in the year 1157. Canute[15] had by his own appointment dissolved the triple union of his kingdoms, having bequeathed them separately to his three sons; Norway was yet more effectually disjoined from the others by the expulsion of the prince, to whom it had been bequeathed, the mother of the young prince having given some offence to the nation. England, which was at the same time separated from Denmark, was soon afterwards again united with it by the advancement of the king of Denmark to the English throne after the death of his brother; but the renewed connexion was finally dissolved by the imbecility of this prince, and the almost total extinction of the princes of the family of Canute[16]. The short interruption of the decay of Denmark, which has been mentioned, was occasioned by the renewal of the union with Norway, the king of that country[17] having been placed upon the throne of Denmark after the death of Hardicanute, the last of the Anglo-Danish sovereigns. The bearing of this renewal of the connexion[18] we perceive in the success, with which the common ruler of the two countries encountered the formidable pirates of the Baltic. This prince, who was named Magnus, abandoned[19] through moderation to Edward the Confessor his pretension to the crown of England, justly considering two kingdoms as sufficient to exercise all his attention. At his death Denmark and Norway were again separated, and the gradual decay of the former country, which was then again begun, was continued without any other interruption to the year 1157.

Denmark[20] is represented as at this time dishonoured abroad and enfeebled at home, and requiring all the exertion of a skilful and firm ruler. Such a ruler it found in Valde-

[15] Mallet, tome ii. p. 149. [16] There remained one prince, Sweyne the son of Estride sister of Canute and of count Ulso; but he was an exile in Sweden, and arrived in England too late.—Ibid., tome iii. p. 161, note; p. 163, note. [17] Magnus, whose father had been dethroned by Canute, had recovered the kingdom, and concluded with Hardicanute a treaty, by which it was stipulated between them, that the survivor should succeed to the other in the failure of male issue. He was accordingly, at the death of Hardicanute, placed on the throne of Denmark, partly through fear of his power, partly through respect for his virtues, and partly through a desire of maintaining the connexion with Norway.—Ibid., pp. 163. 164. [18] Ibid., pp. 165, 169. [19] Ibid., p. 178. [20] Ibid., p. 275.

mar I., when the death of Sweyne III. had left him in the undivided possession of the throne, for his virtues and his talents, great in themselves, had been disciplined in a youth of suffering, and were then well prepared for beginning the restoration of his country. The reign of Valdemar lasted twenty-five years; that of his immediate successor Canute VI., who exalted the prosperity of Denmark to a degree unexampled in its annals, lasted twenty; and during one half of the forty years of the second Valdemar, its aggrandisement was still progressive.

This second restoration of the power of Denmark appears to have favoured the establishment of the hanseatic confederacy, the great commercial league of the continent of Europe. From the earliest times, as might naturally be supposed, the Baltic was the theatre of the piracies of the uncivilised nations, by which it was bordered, and particularly of the Slavian tribes[21], which occupied its southern shore. The latter, who were denominated Venedi or Vandals, though very different from the Vandal invaders of the southern nations of Europe, had about a century before received a signal overthrow from king Magnus; but they still continued their depredations, and were always the most cruel enemies of Denmark. In the final reduction of these pirates was the vigour of this other period of Danish prosperity exercised, and thus was a necessary preparation made for the establishment of that great confederacy, which connected the commerce of the Rhine with that of the Baltic.

That secret power, says the historian[22] which seems to sport with the establishments of men, had marked this high degree of prosperity as the beginning of a new abasement. For the confederacy, which the reduction of the Vandals had favoured, it then became necessary that the Vandalic empire of Denmark should be overthrown. If that empire had not been established, commerce must have been banished from the shore of the Baltic by the outrages of barbarous violence, which such an empire alone was competent to repress. If it had not been afterwards overthrown, the commerce of the Baltic could not have enjoyed the freedom which was indispensable to its success. Here again we find the same interval of time, which has been twice already

[21] Mallet, tome iii. p. 281. [22] Ibid., p. 403.

noticed. The greatness of Denmark had reached its limit just nineteen years before the year 1241, in which the city of Lubeck began that association of trading cities, which flourished with extraordinary prosperity almost three centuries. A century of distraction and imbecility, which intervened between the second and third restoration of Denmark, afforded an ample opportunity to the hanseatic league, for possessing itself of the commercial stations of the Baltic.

In these very remarkable alternations of fortune some operation of general causes may be discovered. It may be perceived that the practice of bestowing hereditary appanages on the younger members of the royal family, tended naturally to generate disunion and domestic war; and that the aggrandisement of the clergy, however it might serve to counterbalance the power of the nobles, must have contributed to embarrass and obstruct the authority of the sovereign. But in no other European history does it appear, that the personal qualities of sovereigns have so decisively influenced the fortunes of a state. The imprudences, the violences, or the weaknesses, of the Danish monarchs form in a considerable degree the history of each period of the decline of their people; their talents, their virtues, or their energies, that of each period of their recovery.

Never had the nation been reduced so low, as in the last depression. The foreign possessions were lost[23], the property of the crown was almost all wrested from it, the royal authority annihilated, the commerce of the kingdom engrossed by the hanseatic merchants, and its naval power ruined with its commerce. So ruined, indeed, was the country[24], that a papal interdict, which was continued almost eight years, had scarcely any operation, the public interest attracting no concern.

The third restoration of Denmark was connected with the accomplishment of that triple union of the northern kingdoms, which has been compared, in respect of its formation and results, to the empire of Charlemagne.

The prince, who began this third restoration, was the third of the name of Valdemar. He succeeded to the throne in the year 1340, and was followed, after a vigorous reign

[23] Mallet, tome iv. pp. 167, 168. [24] Ibid., pp. 148, 149.

of thirty-five years, by Olafr, or Olaus III., the heir-apparent of Norway, whose mother, the celebrated Margaret, distinguished by the appellation of the Semiramis of the north, was a daughter of Valdemar. The marriage of Margaret had not promised a result so important, as the king of Denmark had then a son living, and there were also two other princes of the royal family, a duke of Sleswick and his son; but these impediments were successively removed by death out of the way of Olaus before the decease of Valdemar.

The prince of Norway, though but five years old, was chosen[25] to succeed to the throne of Denmark; and his minority afforded a favourable opportunity for the exercise of the extraordinary talents of his mother, by whose influence his succession was probably effected. It happened indeed that two successive minorities contributed to furnish a favourable opportunity for the abilities of Margaret, Olaus having died in the seventeenth year of his age. Eight years before this event, the death of his father had transferred to him the crown of Norway, so that two of the three neighbouring kingdoms had at that time become actually united under him as sovereign, and his mother as regent. Their experience of the government of Margaret[26], and the desire of continuing the connexion with Norway, determined the Danes to intrust their crown to her, who had already satisfactorily exercised its powers; and the Norwegians, though more averse from a female reign, which was even expressly forbidden by their ancient laws, were yet induced to make a similar appointment, a provision being made that Eric, her grand-nephew, who was then but five years old, should be named to the succession, and should in the interval enjoy the title of king. The ad-

[25] In the Account of Denmark as it was in the year 1692, originally published in the year 1694, the author says, that Denmark was, until within the last thirty-two years, governed by a king chosen by the people of all sorts; and quotes the answer given by king Valdemar III. to the papal nuncio; naturam habemus a Deo, *regnum a subditis*, divitias a parentibus, religionem a Romanâ ecclesiâ, quam, si nobis invides, renunciamus per præsentes, pp. 27, 28. Lond. 1738. Sweden in the like manner continued to be an elective kingdom through the whole period preceding the union of Calmar.—Sheridan's Hist. of the Late Revol. in Sweden, p. 75. Dubl. 1778. Norway appears to have had a similar constitution.—Tablean des Etats Danois par Catteau, tome i. p. 151. Paris, 1802. [26] Mallet, tome iv. pp. 265, &c.

vancement of Margaret to the sovereignty of Denmark occurred in the year 1387, and in the next year she obtained the royal power of Norway. Ten years afterwards the great object of all her policy was attained by the completion of the union of Calmar[27], which combined these two kingdoms with Sweden under a common monarch. It may be held that, as the delicate and artful management of a female reign was necessary for reconciling interests so discordant, so was a combination of peculiar circumstances indispensable, for disposing the fierce warriors of the north to submit themselves to female government.

Of the early history of Norway we know little more than that its people infested with their expeditions the more southern countries, and that it was occasionally connected with Denmark. The reign of its first king Harold Harfagre[28], who in the year 885 established himself on the throne by the overthrow of all his rivals, is its most interesting period, being distinguished by the most remarkable migrations[29]. As many of the conquered sought retreats on distant shores, some of them established themselves in Iceland[30], and thus opened a communication, which provided a peaceful refuge for the literature of the north[31], when it was

[27] So named from a town of Sweden, in which it was concluded.

[28] Antiq. Celto-Scandicæ, p. 1. [29] Ibid., pp. 2, 3. [30] That island had been previously inhabited, and a knowledge of the Christian religion appears to have been introduced probably from Ireland, for the Norwegians found there some Irish books, bells, crosiers, and other things of this sort.—Ibid., p. 14. See p. 97, note 18. [31] An ancient Icelandic manuscript has preserved a list of all the poets, who had distinguished themselves in these northern kingdoms, from the reign of Regner Lodbrog to that of Valdemar II., or from the year 750 to the year 1157. Of these, which are two hundred and thirty in number, the greatest part were natives of Iceland. We are also indebted to that island for almost all the historical monuments of the northern nations now remaining. The literary character of Iceland was maintained chiefly from the year 1000, in which, with the knowledge of Christianity, the art of writing became more generally known, to the year 1264, in which, being reduced by Norway, it lost the animating principle of independence. The poetry of the north appears to have been of an extravagant character, every thing being expressed in it by allegories, metaphors, and hyperboles. Torfæus judges that the name *scald*, which they gave to their poets, signified originally a smoother and polisher of language.—Mallet, tome i., pp. 342, 344. Bishop Percy's North. Antiq. vol. i. p. 386, note. Letters on Iceland, by Uno Von Troil, p. 161.

driven from the continent by frequent and long continued hostilities. The important migration of Rolfr, or Rollo, who led the Normans into France, was a result of an edict issued by this prince, prohibiting his subjects from committing piracy within the limits of their country[32]. The chieftain, having violated the ordinance, was in the year 896 driven into exile, and being repelled from England by the vigilance of Alfred, found, in the year 911, a settlement in France, from which his descendant in the fifth generation ascended the throne of the former country.

Sweden, though claiming the same antiquity with Denmark and Norway, was in its early period precluded by its situation from connecting itself in relations so important with the other countries of Europe. In the period preceding the union of Calmar, accordingly we have only to remark the successive arrangements, by which its government was first internally adjusted, and then disposed to yield to the ascendency of the neighbouring kingdoms in forming with them a temporary union.

In the earlier part of the eleventh century[33] the kingdom of the Goths was united to ancient Sweden, which was thus extended towards the Sound, but still separated from it by the province of Scania, then held by the Danes. The five reigns, which occupied almost the whole interval between the middle of the eleventh and that of the twelfth century, constituted, as has been already remarked, the golden age of Sweden, not merely because the Christian religion was then established by the piety and the exemplary conduct of the sovereigns, but also because the authority of law was carefully maintained in an exact administration of justice. This auspicious period, so well fitted for preparing the foundation of a new government, was concluded in the year 1138. It was immediately succeeded by a series of domestic contentions, arising first from the competitions of the united kingdoms of the Swedes and Goths about the elections of their common sovereign, and afterwards from the divisions of the members of the reigning family. But though this was an agitated, it was yet an improving period of the Swedish history, for we find frequent mention of the exertions of the kings to amend the legislation of the country. At length, in the

[32] Antiq. Celto-Scandicæ, pp. 6, 7. [33] Puffend., tome i. pp. 76, &c.

year 1279, Magnus became king of Sweden, and the eleven years of his reign, with thirteen of that of his son, during which the government, on account of his minority, was conducted by an able minister, formed the period of the greatest improvement in its earlier history.

Magnus[34] maintained with so much effect the administration of justice, that he acquired the surname of Ladelas, intimating that locks were rendered useless: having married a daughter of a count of Holstein[35] he was enabled to introduce into Sweden a considerable number of persons of merit, whom he supported against the jealousies of his nobles; and so successfully did he exert his commanding influence in increasing the resources and the power of the crown, that the historian of Sweden[36] was of opinion that, if he had not been prevented by death, he would have bequeathed to his children an absolute authority. His son Birger being but eleven years old when he succeeded to the throne, the government was administered by a regent during thirteen years with wisdom and vigour; and in this interval it was enacted[37], among other legislative reforms, that no man should thenceforward be bought or sold.

In the arrangements, which respectively disposed Denmark and Sweden to enter into a union, we observe a difference corresponding to the positions, which they respectively held in that combination. In Denmark, which became the predominant member of the confederacy, we perceive that the union had been preceded by about the half of a century of energetic government, fitting it for assuming a commanding character; whereas in Sweden, which became the inferior and constrained member, the government, which during two centuries and a half had been gradually acquiring consistency and strength, was in the century preceding the union so relaxed and enfeebled, that it was prepared to yield without resistance to a foreign ascendency.

The latter part of the reign of Birger, during which he himself held the reins of government, was distracted both

[34] Puffend., p. 105. [35] Ibid., p. 102. [36] Ibid., p. 106.

[37] The influence of Christianity in producing this ordinance, appears from the reason assigned in the law, that it was not just that one Christian should sell another, since Jesus Christ had purchased all with his blood.—Ibid., p. 109.

by the dissensions, which prevailed between him and his two brothers, and also by the discontent, which his oppressive conduct excited in the minds of his subjects. This prince was at length driven from the throne, and Magnus, the infant son of a brother, whom he had starved to death, was substituted in his room. Magnus contributed in a twofold manner to the accomplishment of the union. The kingdom of Norway, which he had inherited by his mother, he ceded to his son Haco, who married Margaret of Denmark; and the Swedish historian[38] has remarked, that the exactions, occasioned by the imprudent enterprises of the latter part of his reign, were the cause of all the misfortunes, with which the kingdom was afterwards afflicted. Like his predecessor, Magnus was also driven from the throne for misconduct, and Albert duke of Mecklenburg, a grandson of his sister, was elected king, the deposition of Magnus involving the rejection of his son Haco, then king of Norway. The reign of Albert, like those of his two predecessors, assisted in promoting the union by offending and alienating the people of Sweden[39]. When he had, after a struggle of twenty years, succeeded in establishing his dominion over the whole of the country, he aspired to the possession of absolute power, and for the attainment of this object introduced into it a considerable number of Germans, whom he gratified with all the advantages, which he could bestow. He then proceeded to enrich himself by annexing to the demesnes of the crown a third part of all the estates of land belonging to secular persons, equally as of those belonging to ecclesiastics; and as he actually proceeded to seize the portions, which he claimed, he drove the nobles to seek protection from Margaret of Denmark.

By the election of Albert, Sweden had become subject to the government of a prince[40] who inherited from his mother the nearest pretension to the throne of Denmark, Valdemar III. king of Denmark having left only two

[38] Puffend. tome i. pp. 130, 134, 135. Twenty-eight years of his reign however, twelve besides his minority, were passed in peace; and in this interval, the historian observes, the people, who in the preceding reigns had been burthened with taxes, and harassed by civil wars, had time to re-establish their affairs. [39] Ibid., pp. 149—151.

[40] Ibid., p. 146.

daughters, the elder of whom was the mother of Albert, the younger was married to Haco king of Norway. To fill their vacant throne, the Danes[41], in their anxiety to accomplish a union of the three kingdoms, elected Olafr or Olaus, the son of Haco, because, besides his right of inheritance in regard to Norway, he also derived from his father a pretension to the crown of Sweden, whereas Albert, the reigning king of Sweden, had no pretension to Norway. This determination appears to have decisively influenced the character and the results of the union, to effect which it had been adopted. A connexion was quietly effected between Norway and Denmark by the advancement of the Norwegian prince to the throne of the latter country, while the preferable pretension of Albert, which had been disregarded in favour of Olaus, generated a war with Sweden, which rendered the union, at length effected, a conquest, instead of an alliance. Norway accordingly continued to be connected with the crown of Denmark, while the union of Sweden with the same country was almost from its commencement an occasion of hostility, and was at the last finally dissolved.

The immediate bearing of this celebrated union formed in the year 1397, and finally dissolved in the year 1524, when it had subsisted, though with long and frequent interruptions, a hundred and twenty-seven years, related to the hanseatic confederacy. Lubeck, which is adjacent to the Baltic[42], was the principal city of the confederacy, and the trade of that sea formed a principal part of its commerce. The confederated cities had accordingly advanced with rapid, and nearly successful strides, towards the possession of a monopoly of the trade of the Baltic. They had already almost destroyed the commerce and the marine of Denmark; they had given the most strenuous assistance of their fleets to the rival power of Sweden, of the naval competition of which they were not apprehensive[43]; they had extorted from Denmark a cession of a principal part of the province of Scania, which she possessed on the Swedish side of the Sound; and they had recently formed a powerful settlement at Bergen in Norway, where they had long traded.

[41] Mallet, tome iv. p. 244. [42] Ibid., tome vi. pp. 165, &c.
[43] Ibid., p. 234.

These considerations warrant the conclusion, that a crisis had arrived, at which it was to be determined, whether a government of merchants should rule the Baltic and its shores, or whether the confederacy should receive a shock, which should repress its ambition, accelerate its decline, and occasion the removal of the commerce of Europe to other management. The union of Calmar decided the question[44], for, by connecting the rival powers of the north, it deprived the confederacy of the advantage, which it had enjoyed in their distinctness.

The union served also to hinder the Danes from succeeding to the commercial ascendency of the hanseatic states, for by the wars[45], which arose from it, that strength was exhausted in domestic contention, which the true interest of the triple government would have directed to commercial enterprise. The chief management of the commerce of the Baltic was accordingly from this time divided between the merchants of two cities not included in the confederacy, Hamburg and Copenhagen. The former[46] was retained in a neutrality by the homage, which it had performed to the king of Denmark, and by the wisdom of its burgomaster assumed an ascendency over Lubeck; the latter[47], which at this time become the capital of Denmark, was rendered the emporium of that commerce, which the Danish merchants had before been obliged to manage at the hanseatic towns.

How well the commencement and the duration of the union of Calmar were accommodated in time to the changes of commerce, may appear from these considerations, that at the time of the commencement of the union the Dutch and the English had begun to claim a portion of the trade of the Baltic, and that in the beginning of the sixteenth century[48], or within a few years preceding its final dissolution, the hanse-towns had begun to lose their commercial ascendency. That its longer continuance would have generated disturbance in the system, may be inferred from a reflection of the historian of Denmark. If, says he[49], the successors of Margaret, masters of an immense extent of coast, and of

[44] Mallet, tome v. p. 474. [45] Ibid., tome iv. p. 339. [46] Ibid., p. 336. [47] Ibid., pp. 380, &c. [48] Ibid., tome vi. pp. 167, 168.
[49] Ibid., tome iv. p. 301; tome v. p. 413.

a people eminently qualified for naval service, had invited commerce into their states, and afterwards taken some concern in the conquests of the new world, what empire would have united such resources for ruling at a distance, with a situation so favourable for defence! Instead then of a balanced system of two secondary governments, which opens the trade of the Baltic to the southern states, one powerful empire would have been formed, which must have acted on the general system with a disturbing influence, not only by constituting a force not accommodated to the relations of the system, but more especially by maintaining an exclusive possession of a trade, which was necessary to the resources of the rest.

A remote, but yet more important, operation of the union appears to have consisted in being the process, by which the government of Denmark, raised by its maritime enterprise to an earlier importance, acted upon that of Sweden, then but struggling into existence, and stimulated it to that energy of military heroism, which afterwards, under Gustavus Adolphus, so powerfully affected the interests of Germany, and those of Russia under Charles XII. The energies of a people are in every case excited by the external compression, which it receives from some other, being the efforts of a reaction, which is opposed to the violence of a compressing state. In this relation did Denmark stand in respect of Sweden, not merely as a neighbouring state possessing superior power, but as holding provinces within the natural boundary of the latter, which much restrained the commerce of the Swedes. The union, forced as it was upon that people, and broken by long and frequent interruptions, served to exasperate their resistance to the ascendency of Denmark, and thus to excite and animate the energies, which afterwards gave importance to them in the general combinations of Europe.

Of the two countries Sweden was evidently more fitted than Denmark, to constitute a power, which should in later ages make violent impressions on the neighbouring empires. It was nearly excluded from those maritime communications, which gave a commercial character to its rival and to Norway; and its less genial climate and soil withheld its people in a considerable degree from those agricultural occupations,

which in Denmark contributed to mitigate the fierce independence of the inhabitants. The produce of its mines indeed furnished Sweden with materials of commerce; but the condition of a miner is not favourable to civilisation, and so little did it dispose the people of Sweden[50] to manufacturing industry, that they began only towards the end of the sixteenth century to work their own iron, the ore having been before carried to Dantzic and other parts of Prussia, to be there forged into bars. Though therefore in Denmark, as in Sweden, the peasants constituted a distinct order in the state, and were especially represented in the national legislature, yet in the latter country they were so much less controlled by the opposing influence of towns, which were then few and inconsiderable, and they were so much less disposed to subordination by the general habits of their lives, that they assumed a much bolder tone in the public councils, and were characterised by a spirit of independence, not observable among those of the neighbouring country. The Dalecarlians in particular, inhabiting one of the most mountainous and barren parts of Sweden, were devoted to the cause of liberty[51], and not contented with the exemption from all oppression, which they enjoyed amidst the fastnesses of nature, were ever ready to sally forth from their mountains for the deliverance of their countrymen.

A predisposing cause of the separation of Sweden from Denmark was the hostility, with which the connexion had been effected. Another may be found in the state of society, which was not then prepared for so great an operation in policy; and the historian of Denmark[52] has accordingly

[50] How destitute of trade Sweden in general must have been, appears from the extraordinary privileges granted by Gustavus Vasa to the traders of Lubeck; that they should pay no duties for commodities imported into Sweden, that they should enjoy a monopoly of its trade, and that they might trade at certain towns, not only with the citizens, but also with the peasants.—Sheridan's Hist. of the Late Revol. in Sweden, p. 66. [51] Three of the conditions proposed by the Dalecarlians to Gustavus Vasa, display at once their independence, their superstition, and their simplicity. These were, that he should never pass the boundary of their province without giving hostages for the security of their privileges, that whoever should eat flesh on a fast-day, should be burned, and that both the king and his courtiers should resume the old habit of Sweden, and never afterwards borrow new fashions from strangers.—Sheridan, p. 138. [52] Mallet, tome vi. p. 32.

remarked, that the union would have been maintained without difficulty in an age, in which the people were more accustomed to submission, the sovereigns more moderate and more humane, and at the same time more powerful, and the ministers better acquainted with the true principles of government. But the formal renewal of the union, in the year 1436, has induced the same writer to ascribe much to the operation of individual characters. Since, he asks[53], after so many false measures, imprudences, troubles, and unsuccessful wars, it was re-established of itself, and solely by the vigour of its own constitution, with what ease might it not have been rendered durable by a prince a little politic, and made the basis of a solid grandeur? But providence, he adds, had doubtless decreed to subvert the work of Margaret, by giving her Eric as a successor. And he afterwards remarks[54], if we collect the principal particulars of the life of this prince, we must at once perceive, that no character could be more opposed than his to that of Margaret, nor consequently any more proper for destroying the great work, which she had left to him to be accomplished. Nor is the deciding influence of individual character on this interesting occasion observable only among the Danes, for, while the violences of the sovereign[55] excited a general fermentation in Sweden, at the same time appeared in the person of the Swedish hero, Gustavus Vasa, one of those extraordinary men, who seem to be produced from time to time for determining the fortunes of nations.

This young lord, endowed with every quality, which might fit him for exciting and directing the enthusiasm of a people, was urged by private wrongs to attempt the deliverance of his country. First irritated by the perfidy with which he had been carried a prisoner into Denmark, when he had been delivered as one of five hostages for the safety of the king in Stockholm, he was afterwards yet more strongly excited to vengeance by a massacre perpetrated in the capital, in which his father, with many of his relatives and friends, had perished. Having effected his escape from the captivity, in which he had been unjustly detained, he obtained some inconsiderable assistance from the people

[53] Mallet, tome iv. p. 397. [54] Ibid., p. 421. [55] Ibid., tome v. p. 471.

of Lubeck[56], who were jealous of the union, which connected Sweden with Denmark, and then sought his native land, where however he was received with so much apprehension, and even alienation, as would have destroyed the hopes of any other adventurer. At length, though not without much difficulty and danger, he found a refuge among the Dalecarlians. From the mountains of their rude province, followed by about two hundred peasants, he boldly proceeded on the enterprise, which after three years terminated in the final dissolution of the union, and in placing Gustavus himself on the throne of his country, to become the founder of a new dynasty, and the author of the greatness of Sweden.

Various causes, on the other hand, co-operated to maintain the connexion of Norway with Denmark, which had not, like that of Sweden with the same country, been weakened by any antecedent hostility. Eric, whose conduct contributed so much to the alienation of the Swedes, was particularly indulgent to the Norwegians[57], one of whom was his favourite minister; and he accordingly experienced from them a degree of attachment, which was not manifested by his other subjects. The Norwegians[58] also appear to have been of themselves disposed to avoid as much as possible all hostility with their neighbours, whether because this was the wish of their clergy, who exercised a very considerable influence over them, or because they had been much enfeebled by their dissensions, by the decay of their commerce, by the loss of the greater part of their ancient conquests, and by the great pestilence of the fourteenth century. In these circumstances too[59] the example of the sufferings endured by the Swedes, in the struggles which preceded the final dissolution of their union with the Danes, would operate powerfully on the minds of the Norwegians, indisposing them to adhere to their connexion with that people; and indeed the extraordinary severity[60] exercised by the king of Denmark, about

[56] A residence of several months in Lubeck, during which he was soliciting this aid, afforded him an opportunity of becoming acquainted with the doctrine of Luther, the introduction and establishment of which he afterwards connected with the revolution of Sweden.

[57] Mallet, tome iv. p. 425. [58] Ibid., tome v. pp. 44, 45.

[59] Ibid., p. 214. [60] Ibid., pp. 290, 305.

twenty years before the separation of Sweden, in punishing a rebellion, which had been excited in Norway by the Swedes, destroyed so large a portion of the nobility of that country, as must have disabled it for any effort of hostility.

Thus was at length constituted, in the year 1524 an adverse combination of two states of a secondary order, the one, composed of Denmark and Norway, being more of a maritime, the other, which was Sweden, rather of a military character. The opposing powers of this combination maintained the freedom of the Baltic for the Dutch and English; and the dread of the predominance of Denmark served to excite in Sweden those energies, which acted with so much power on the two empires of Germany and Russia.

CHAPTER XI.

Of the histories of the Turks and Persians, from the suppression of the caliphate in the year 1258, *to the accession of Solyman I. to the throne of Turkey in the year* 1520.

The empire of the Moguls divided in the year 1259—The Ottoman government begun, 1301—The Ottomans invaded Europe, 1341—Bajazet overthrown by Tamerlane, 1402—Constantinople taken, 1453—The dynasty of the Sophis begun in Persia, 1502—Egypt and Syria reduced by the Ottomans, 1517.

THE Arabs and the Turks, though they successively discharged the same function in compressing the Christian states of Europe, were of very different characters, and exercised upon the system of Europe agencies very differently modified. The former, while by a fierce spirit of hostility they forced into some degree of union the alarmed governments of the southern countries of Europe, served also to convey to them the stores of science, to communicate the first inspirations of poetic composition, and to elevate to a more rapturous temperament the chivalry formed in the sober usages of the west. The latter, incapable of imparting principles of refinement, were qualified merely to continue the hostility of the

Arabs. A government of enduring and unalterable barbarism became established within the limits of Europe, rejecting all the intercourses of amicable communication, and professing to wage inexpiable and interminable war.

When the spirit of scientific enquiry had been sufficiently exerted, to require other information than oriental researches could supply, when the poetry of modern Europe, having been taught to lisp its earliest numbers, was prepared for receiving the lessons of ancient composition without prejudice to its own originality, and the chivalrous character of the west had been completed by the admixture of Arabian enthusiasm with European sentiment, the fierce barbarism of the Turks was best fitted to act externally upon a system, then unformed indeed, but already furnished with all the principles of future improvement. The progress of the Turkish power, spreading from Asia to Europe, and overwhelming the ancient capital of the eastern empire, with its remaining provinces, drove into the west the teachers of the language of Greece, bearing with them the precious reliques of its classic compositions[1]. When too the age of distant discovery had arrived, and it had become expedient that the commercial enterprise of Europe should be directed to the ocean, the Turkish government extended its barbarous dominion also over Egypt, obstructing the communications, by which the commerce of Europe was then chiefly maintained. When,

[1] It has been recently ascertained that no ancient manuscripts have been preserved in the libraries of European Turkey, as had been hoped by the learned. The result of the researches of Mr. Carlyle and Mr. Hunt, made in the year 1799, in the most favourable circumstances, was that the monasteries of the Sea of Marmora did not contain a single classical fragment; that in the collegiate-house of the Greek patriarch at Constantinople there were a few detached fragments of some of the Greek classics; that in the rooms attached to the mosque of saint Sophia, the libraries of the seraglio, and those belonging to the schools, mosques, and colleges of dervices at Constantinople, not a single classical fragment of a Greek or Latin author, either original or translated, was to be found; and that in those of the monasteries of Mount Athos, the great supports of the religion of the Greeks, no unedited fragment of any classical author was ever discovered.—Walpole's Memoirs of Turkey, pp. 34, 220. Lond. 1817 One hundred and twenty thousand manuscripts are indeed said to have disappeared in the pillage of Constantinople; and ten volumes, it is added, might have been purchased for a single ducat, which price included the whole works of Aristotle and Homer.—Decline and Fall, &c., vol. vi. p. 505.

lastly, the great struggle of the reformation was preparing in Germany that balance of contending principles to which Europe has been indebted for the equilibrium of its political adjustment, the hostility of Turkey, pressing from time to time upon the sovereign of the empire, assisted the efforts of the protestants, and the cause of religious and political independence.

The empire of the Mogul Tatars, which had been formed by Zingis, who died in the year 1227, suppressed in the year 1258 the caliphate of Bagdad, and closed the series of the successors of Mohammed. That empire was however transient as a meteor in the history of nations, for in the very year following the conquest of Bagdad[2] and the suppression of the caliphate, a disputed succession induced Cublai, the rightful heir, to gratify three great leaders[3], by acknowledging their authority over considerable states, subject only to an admission of his own supreme dominion. At the death of this emperor, which occurred in the year 1292, even this slight pretension was rejected, and the great vassals became openly independent. Of these new sovereigns Holagou, the conqueror of Bagdad, became lord of a very extensive dominion, comprehending the central countries[4] of the greater with the whole of the lesser Asia.

[2] Decline and Fall, &c., vol. i. p. 307. [3] Cublai, or Cuplai, ceded to one prince all the territory of the Moguls which lay beyond the river Amu, to another Kipzack, and to a third the country between the Altai mountains and the Amu, or the regions now distinguished by the names of Great Bucharia, Charass'm, and Turkestan, with the western part of the territory of the Calmucks. The posterity of Cublai continued to reign in China, of which he had completed the conquest: and when, at the end of one hundred and forty years, the Tatars were expelled from that country, they probably reigned afterwards over those, who retired to the shore of the Sea of Japan, as these continued to have khans.—Abulgasi-Bayadur-chan, with the notes of the translator, pp. 384, 385. The Tatars were driven from China for having endeavoured to introduce the worship of the Lamas, to which they had attached themselves.—Ibid., p. 404, note.

[4] Ben Schonah has enumerated the states which Holagou bequeathed to his son. They consisted of the great province named Khorassan, the capital of which was Nischabour; the Persian Irak, the country of the Parthians, the capital of which was Ispahan; the Arabian or Babylonian Irak, comprehending Assyria and Chaldea, of which Baggad was the capital: Adherbigian or Media, the capital of which was Tabriz or Tauris; Persia properly so called, the capital of which was

The monarchy of the Seljukian Turks, which in the time of the crusades had occupied the lesser Asia, was at this time[5] divided among numerous chieftains, who all acknowledged the supremacy of the khan of Persia. A salutary control was exercised by the khan over these contending nobles, until the Ottoman power began to be formed from the ruins of the Seljukian monarchy. It has accordingly been remarked[6], that the decline of the Mogul dominion of central Asia served to allow free room for its construction. The great empire formed by Zingis appears thus to have been an intermediate arrangement, which was the transition from the Arabic empire of Persia to the Ottoman dominion of the lesser Asia. The empire of Zingis speedily suppressed that of the Arabs, and was itself immediately afterwards dismembered; the southern government, thus separated from the rest, served to maintain for a time some degree of order among the Seljukian chiefs its vassals: and in the year 1304, at which time the Ottoman government had begun to be formed, this detached portion of the Mogul dominion also sunk into weakness and decay, and left the Ottomans free to construct their new monarchy.

Among the provincial governors of the Persian territory[7], who assumed independence, was Aladin[8] the sultan of Iconium, a lordship in the lesser Asia. The father of Othman, the leader of the Oguzians, the noblest of the Scythian tribes[9], having entered into the service of this prince, the son acquired such a sway, that, when Aladin had been driven from his principality by an irruption of another tribe of Tatars, he was in the beginning of the year 1301 established in the dignity of sultan. The name of Turk[10] having fallen into disrepute, as it had been contemptuously applied

Schriaz; Khourestan or Khouzistan, the ancient Susiana, the capital of which was Toster or Schuster, anciently Susa; Diarbekir, containing a part of Assyria or Curdistan and also Mesopotamia, the capital of which was Moussal or Mosul, near the site of the ancient Nineveh; and the country of Roum, or of the Greeks, comprehending Armenia, Georgia, and the lesser Asia, the capital of which was Conia, the ancient city of Iconium in Cappadocia.—D'Herbelot, art. *Holagu*.

[5] Abulgasi-Bayadur-chan, pp. 384, 385. [6] Decline and Fall, &c., vol. vi. pp. 309, 310. [7] Hist. de l'Empire Othoman par Cantimir, pref. p. lii. Paris, 1743. [8] For the title *sultan*, see book i. ch. xx. note 10. [9] Cantimir, tome i. p. 12. [10] Ibid., pref., p. lii. et tome i. p. 33.

by the Persians to tribes much inferior to themselves in the beauty of their persons, the new sultan ordained, that it should thenceforward be limited to the peasants, and that his immediate followers should from himself be denominated Ottomans.

The new government[11] was subjected to that discipline of rivalry, which is the general principle of excitement to the efforts of nations. Caramanogli, one of those Persian satraps, who like Aladin had shaken off the yoke of dependence, became the founder of a government, which comprehended the ancient Galatia, from him named Carimania. This government, the most powerful after that of Iconium, was constantly opposed to that of the Ottomans, which had been formed out of the principality of Aladin, and accordingly served to restrain its efforts, until it was itself overpowered by the same Mohammed, who became the conqueror of Constantinople, and established the seat of the Turkish power in that capital of the ancient empire.

It has been observed by Busbequius[12], who in the sixteenth century was a curious witness of the greatest prosperity of the Turks, that their indifference to the elegancies, and even to the accommodations of the architectural art, must be ascribed to the habits of a roving and military life. The same cause has probably rendered them insensible to other refinements, equally as to those of architecture, and to fix them in a permanent and unalterable barbarism. Striking in this respect is the contrast between them and the Mohammedans of Arabia. The latter, advancing in a rapid and almost unresisted career of conquest to the establishment of an empire of extraordinary magnitude, soon became not less distinguished by commercial and literary eminence, than by the successes of their arms; the former, proceeding slowly through an obstructed course, were naturally disposed to retain in their prosperity the rudeness, which had been fixed in their efforts to acquire it, and looked on the venerable monuments of art and intellect, which were the spoils of their victory, almost with the same indifference, which might be expected of a horde just issuing from the wilds of Tatary. Some diversity would probably in any

[11] Cantimir, pref., p. lxviii. tome i. p. 186. [12] A Gislenii Busbequii Epist., pp. 27, 28. Lug. Bat. 1633.

circumstances have long continued to subsist between the descendants of nations formed in climates so different, and the commercial situation of the Arabian peninsula had probably impressed its character on the tribes, which rushed forth from it to spread over the earth the dominion of the koran; but some portion also of the distinction appears to have arisen from the rudeness of a long-protracted warfare, and of a gradually migratory government[13].

The interval between the elevation of Othman and the reduction of Constantinople was a period of one hundred and fifty-two years, of which the century beginning from the former event was filled by a series of four princes of extraordinary ability, well qualified both to extend and consolidate the new dominion.

The victorious Othman, who began this series, proceeded systematically in the work of conquest[14]. Instead of abandoning himself to an unrestrained ambition, he checked himself from time to time in his successes, that he might have leisure for establishing order and tranquillity in his new provinces, before he should seek to enlarge his territory by other acquisitions. In this progress of conquest he first reduced almost the whole of the ancient Bithynia, and afterwards extended his dominion over a great number of cities in other parts of the lesser Asia. This beautiful peninsula, which in an early age had given a beginning to the refinement of the Greeks, and had afterwards been the scene of much of the preaching of the apostles, and of the seven churches addressed in the Apocalypse, was destined thus in the fourteenth century to be the birth-place of an empire of barbarism, which should inflict a painful, but salutary discipline, on the nations of Christendom.

Othman, after a brilliant reign of twenty-five years, was succeeded by his son Orchan, who was distinguished by various endowments, though especially remarkable for valour. The reign of this prince[15] is the epoch of the institutions of the Ottoman monarchy. Appointing his brother to be his

[13] The first capital of Othman was Carachisar, the next Yenghischehri. Orchan his successor established his residence in Prusa; and after a hundred and twenty-five years, in which Adrianople was a secondary capital, Constantinople at length became the metropolis of the empire. [14] Cantimir, tome i. p. 37. [15] Ibid., pp. 67, 68.

lieutenant in all the concerns of his government, he thus instituted the office of grand visir. He then formed the military system of the Turks, by introducing the use of engines for besieging towns, and enrolling a body of infantry, to which he allowed a regular pay; this infantry he further improved by composing it of the sons of Christians educated in the religion of Mohammed, having found it refractory as it was originally composed of Turkish peasants. He was at the same time an encourager of religion, and a patron of learning. Having established the seat of his government at Prusa, or Byrsa, a city of Bithynia, which province he completely reduced, he founded there a mosque, an hospital, and an academy[16], the last of which became so distinguished, that it was frequented by students from Persia and Arabia. Nor was the extension of his empire interrupted by this attention to the interior concerns of his government. When he had first by his arms reduced the Greeks of Asia, he then by force or address caused his sovereignty to be acknowledged by many Moslem princes, who had possessed themselves of various provinces; and when his dominion was thus at length extended to the shore of the strait, which separates Europe from Asia[17], the dissensions of the Grecian court afforded in the year 1341 an occasion for an army of Turks, to effect their first passage into Europe, as the friends of one of the contending parties.

Orchan was, after a reign of thirty-five years, succeeded by his son Amurath, who also inherited all his virtues. The new sultan immediately directed his attention to Europe, where the dominion of the Turks then began to be considerable. The institution of the Janisaries[18], which had been

[16] Cantimir, tome i. p. 71. [17] Decline and Fall, &c., vol. vi. p. 315. [18] Named by the Turks Jenitcheri, or new troops.—D'Herbelot, art. *Jenitcheri.* As early as in the middle of the sixteenth century they ceased to be formed of stranger captives, devoted to the sovereign, the Christians redeeming their children; and about the year 1680 a commutation was fixed for ever with Mohammed IV. Originally they had not been permitted to marry. As the government became weak, this permission was granted. People of all sorts, even children, were then enrolled for protection, and military exercises were abandoned, the troops being mustered only on pay-days.—Constantinople in 1828, by C. Macfarlane, p. 319, note. Lond. 1829. They were extirpated in the year 1826, 10,000 having been massacred, and an equal number compelled to quit Constantinople.—Walsh's Resi-

begun by his father, was completed by Amurath, every fifth captive being reserved for the service of the sultan. The corps thus constituted performed the most important services. The fame of the Turkish arms was immediately exalted to a very high degree; and even in the sixteenth century the Ottoman soldiery[19] was considered as the best in Europe. By this soldiery[20], at the end of forty-five years from their first invasion of Europe, the power of the Ottomans was established throughout almost all Macedonia and Albania.

This prince was succeeded by his son Bajazet, the fourth in a succession of heroes. The Grecian empire in the year 1390, at which time Bajazet began his reign, was almost reduced to the capital. Constantinople was not, however, besieged before the year 1395, the interval having been occupied with other enterprises both in Asia and in Europe. Then indeed the period of the Greek empire seemed to have arrived; but it was otherwise decreed by the divine providence, and a double agency was employed to arrest its apparent destiny, and to procure for it a delay of ruin during fifty-eight years. When the sultan[21] was posted before the capital, and ready to rush upon his prey, the grand visir in his prudence represented to him, that it would be wise to think of securing the internal tranquillity of his extensive dominions, before he should augment them by additional conquests; and that it would be dangerous to provoke a combination of the powers of Christendom, which could not regard with indifference the loss of their common bulwark. The sultan, yielding to his admonition, consented to grant a truce of ten years, on the condition of receiving an annual tribute, and of certain concessions[22], by which the authority,

dence at Constantinople, vol. ii. app. vii. Lond. 1836. It had been found that they were the instruments of the Oulemâh in resisting all approach to the improvement of other nations. [19] Busbequii Epist., pp. 174—177. [20] Cantimir, tome i. p. 100. [21] Ibid., pp. 144, &c.

[22] The stipulations were that the Ottomans should have liberty to build in Constantinople a mosque and a court of justice, and to have a cady, who should have power to decide any litigation, which might arise there between two Mohammedans, a similar privilege being reciprocally allowed to the Christians in Adrianople; a contention between a Christian and a Mohammedan was in Constantinople to be referred to the patriarch, in Adrianople to the ecclesiastical judge of the Mohammedans.—Ibid., p. 148.

and even the religion of the Ottoman government, was recognised within the walls of Constantinople. Before this disgraceful truce had expired, a new and formidable conqueror interposed and overwhelmed Bajazet with unlooked-for ruin. In the second year of the fifteenth century [23] Tamerlane arrived in the lesser Asia from the banks of the Ganges, and in a bloody engagement overthrew the sultan, and took him prisoner.

That the Ottoman government should, during a whole century, have made a regular and rapid progress towards the subversion of the Greek empire, and that, when this empire was awaiting the pleasure of its overpowering enemy, the consummation of the enterprise should have been suddenly postponed for fifty years by the unexpected intervention of an extraordinary personage, who was himself snatched away by death within three years, leaving the government, which he had subdued, to the son of the vanquished prince, seems to be, perhaps more than any other event in the history of nations, a fortuitous concurrence of agencies, destitute of all relation to any common result. An attentive consideration may, however, discover, that this first impression is made only by the extent of the combination, the occurrences being in truth connected, though in relations so comprehensive as not to be easily perceived.

In Tamerlane we see the eventual restorer of the empire of Persia, which had become necessary for balancing the new monarchy of the Ottomans. Soon after the beginning of the thirteenth century that empire had been assailed by Zingis, and after forty-five years it was overthrown by his successor, leaving its ruins to furnish materials for the Ottoman government. The interval of sixty-four years, interposed between the reduction of Bagdad and the fall of Bajazet, was the period of the formation and growth of the new monarchy; and when this power had been sufficiently matured, and was evidently adequate to the functions of an independent, and even predominating state, the interest of the political system of Europe required that it should be balanced and controlled by the restored empire of Persia. It was well known that the Turks were in the fifteenth and

[23] Decline and Fall, &c., vol. vi., pp. 342, &c.

sixteenth centuries[24] most formidable to the governments of Christendom. The importance of the dread of the Persian empire, as a restraint of their enterprises[25], has been distinctly stated by Busbequius, who had been deputed from Vienna to endeavour to negociate an accommodation, and, when he had during eight years suffered all the indignity of personal restraint[26], was well satisfied with obtaining a truce of as many more, even on the dishonourable condition of paying to the Turks an annual tribute of thirty thousand ducats of Hungary.

It was the conjecture of Newton that comets, coming from distances exceeding the dimensions of the solar system, and passing in their rapid courses through the planetary orbits, served to diffuse from their prodigious exhalations the renovating principles of fertility and life. The two Tatar conquerors may be regarded as comets of the political world. Issuing from wilds, which lay beyond the combinations of policy, they rushed through the civilised nations with resistless impetuosity, and by their transient, but powerful agency, gave to the system the impulses, which some important crisis of human interests happened at each period to demand.

The ravages of these extraordinary conquerors did however elsewhere terminate in lasting establishments. By Zingis and his successors China was gradually subdued[27], and the Tatar dynasty begun, which was established in the government of that immense country about the year 1279, but was expelled by the native Chinese in the year 1367, or one hundred and forty years after the death of that conqueror. Tamerlane on the other hand eventually gave being to

[24] Quæ cogitantem horror corripit, quid postremo futurum sit, cum hanc nostram rationem cum eorum comparo, superare alteros, alteros interire necesse est; ambo certe incolumes esse non possumus. Ab illâ parte stant immensæ imperii opes, vires integræ, armorum usus et exercitatio, miles veteranus, victoriarum assiduitas, laborum patientia, concordia, ordo, disciplina, frugalitas, vigilantia: ab hâc nostrâ, publica egestas, privatus luxus, diminutæ vires, fracti animi, laboris et armorum insolentia, contumaces milites, duces avari, disciplinæ contemptus, licentia, temeritas, ebrietas, crapula; quodque est pessimum, illis vincere, nobis vinci solitum.—Busbeq. Epist., p. 174. [25] Unus modo Persa intercedit, quem ad nos festinans hostis respicere cogitur, sed is moram adfert, non salutem. Hoc composito, cum totius orientis viribus in nostras cervices ingruet, quam paratos non audeo dicere.—Ibid. [26] Ibid., pp. 360, 454. [27] Decline and Fall, &c., vol. vi. pp. 297, 307.

the Mogul dominion of Hindostan[28], which both acquired for its chief the title of the Great Mogul, while the original horde was lost in its native Tatary, and also had the fortune of a much longer duration than the Chinese empire of the Moguls, having subsisted in vigour to the death of Aurungzeb[29] in the year 1707, and in some degree even to the year 1788, or two hundred and sixty-two years from the commencement of the Mogul dynasty of that country.

The seeds of the political disunion of the Turks and Persians had been sown almost from the commencement of their common religion, or more than eight centuries before the re-establishment of the Persian government. Two parties had been early formed among the followers of Mohammed, the one of which was attached to the family of Ali, the cousin and son-in-law of the impostor, and the other was opposed to his pretensions. The party of the followers of Ali however did not become considerable in Persia until the year 933, or during about three centuries from the death of Mohammed. At that time, the caliphate sinking into decay, and various independent princes partitioning the Arabian empire, the native dynasty of the Bowides, which established itself in the government of that country, embraced the party of Ali[30], probably because its founder bore the same name. As the Turkish dynasties, which were also established within

[28] The commencement of the Mogul dynasty of India followed the invasion of Tamerlane at an interval of one hundred and twenty-seven years. Tamerlane in the years 1398 and 1399 subdued India and returned to Samarcund. Ulugh Beg, his grandson, devoted himself to the arts of peace, and in particular caused the astronomical tables, distinguished by his name, to be constructed. Baber, a descendant of Tamerlane in the fifth generation, when he had maintained a long and glorious struggle against Shahibeg, khan of the Usbeg Tatars, retreated into India, in the year 1525, and completed the conquest in the following year.—Malcolm's Hist. of Persia, vol. i. pp. 471, 472, 488, 499. Maurice's Mod. Hist. of Hindostan, vol. ii. part i. pp. 90, &c. Lond. 1803.

[29] Maurice's Mod. Hist. of Hindostan, vol. ii. part ii. p. 285, and Suppl. pp. 626—636. The empire of Aurungzeb, which had reached from the tenth to the thirty-fifth degree of latitude, and nearly as far in longitude, and had produced a revenue exceeding thirty-two millions of pounds sterling, was in the year 1788 reduced to one ruined city, Delhi, with a small surrounding district, and a few lacks of rupees allowed for the subsistence of the emperor by a vassal chief. Sir J. Malcolm remarks that 'a pageant, supported by the British nation, still sits upon the 'throne of a Delhi.'—Hist. of Persia, vol. i. pp. 484, 485. [30] D'Herbelot, art. *Buiah.*

the empire, attached themselves to the contrary party, that mutual animosity of the Turks and Persians was even then begun, which, after the lapse of five hundred and sixty-six years, had its full manifestation in their political relations. Though however the followers of Ali are detested as heretics by the Turks with such fervour of abomination[31], that they consider it equally meritorious to kill one Persian as to destroy seventy Christians, it does not appear the two parties differed in any other particulars, than the antiquated question of the right of Ali to succeed to the caliphate, and some ridiculous disagreements about ceremonial observances[32].

When Tamerlane was returning from the defeat of Bajazet, he gave thirty thousand captives to Sudder-u-deen, in testimony of his reverence for this Persian[33], who had acquired the reputation of a saint, and had asked their release, when required to say what favour the conqueror should bestow as a proof of his veneration. The captives thus emancipated became the devoted disciples of him, to whom they were indebted for their liberty, and their descendants, at the end of a century, placed one of his family on the throne of his country. Ismail, the first prince of this dynasty, which has been distinguished by the title of sophi[34], commenced his reign in the year 1502. As the Greek capital had been reduced only forty-nine years before, this commencement of the restoration of the Persian monarchy was sufficiently early for restraining the aggressions of the Turks, especially as even in the year 1480 the Persian hostilities were sufficiently

[31] Cantimir, tome ii. p. 160. [32] The Turks, says Cantimir, tome ii. pp. 159, 160, are no sooner out of bed, than they consider themselves obliged by the law, before they begin their prayer, to wash their feet, and to rub them with the hand before they put on their slippers; the Persians on the contrary maintain, that it is sufficient to rub the feet with the naked hand without washing them. According to Sir J. Malcolm, the practical distinctions of the two sects consist in the modes of holding the hands and of making prostrations, and other forms equally unimportant.—Hist. of Persia, vol. ii. p. 351, note.

[33] Krusinskis Hist. of the late Revolutions of Persia, vol. i. pp. 5. 6. Lond., 1740. [34] Sir J. Malcolm appears to conceive that this title was derived from *soqffee*, the appellation of a philosophical devotee, which seems to have been particularly applied to the first distinguished person of the family, Suffee-u-deen, both *soqffee* and *suffee* being derived from the same root *suffâ*, signifying *clean* or *pure*.—Hist. of Persia, vol. i. pp. 495, 496. D'Herbelot derives the word from the Greek term signifying *a wise man*. Art. *Sofi*.

formidable to cause an army of Turks to be recalled from Italy[35].

The great defeat of Bajazet was followed by a period of eleven years, during which the distresses of the Ottoman empire were aggravated by the contest of two of his sons; and all historians agree that, if the Christian princes had known how to avail themselves of its disorders[36], this government would either have been totally destroyed, or at least driven out of Europe. But the circumstances of Christendom disqualified it for such an effort, and Mohammed I., who was then placed upon the throne, re-established the dominion of his family. After this interruption we again observe a series of heroic and successful emperors on the throne of the Ottomans, and their dominion, which had been checked and thrown back by the irruption of Tamerlane, resumed its advances towards the subjugation of the Greek empire.

Mohammed I., after a reign of nearly nine years, distinguished by the institutions of peace, not less than by the achievements of war, was succeeded by his son, Amurath II., who, in a reign of thirty-six years, exhibited every quality, which could adorn a sovereign. While this prince embraced every opportunity of encouraging the useful arts, he was successful in every military enterprise, except in his attack of Belgrade, the bulwark of the west. In his faithful observance of treaties too he exhibited an example, which might shame the Christians, for, though the Roman pontiff had authorised the king of Hungary to renew the war in disregard of a solemn engagement, Amurath honourably observed the treaty, which he had concluded with the emperor[37]. Amurath II. died in the year 1451, and in the third year of the reign of his son and successor, Mohammed II., a period was put to the lingering agony of the Greek empire by the reduction of the capital. A circumstance, connected with this important event, deserves to be noticed, as it may serve to show, how much the great issues of political events may be affected by contingencies. On the day following the capture of Constantinople, twenty-nine gallies arrived from the west for its relief[38]. Since the Turks on a mere rumour

[35] Cantimir, tome ii. p. 29. [36] Ibid. tome i. p. 235. [37] Hist. de'Sicile par Burigny, tome ii. p. 106. [38] Ibid. pp. 132, 133.

of this armament had deliberated about raising the siege, it may be concluded that, if it had arrived before the reduction of the city, the enterprise would have been immediately abandoned.

When the Latins, in the prosecution of the crusades, had possessed themselves of the capital and the territory of their Greek allies, the spirit of the Greek empire still subsisted in three establishments of its fugitives, two of which assumed the title of the imperial dignity. Theodore Lascaris[39], who had married the daughter of the emperor Alexius, soliciting the alliance of the Turkish sultan, established himself at Nice in Bithynia, and at length comprehended within his dominion the whole territory extending from the Mæander to the suburb of Constantinople. About the same time the grandson of another emperor[40], who was governor, or duke of Trebizond, availed himself of the public confusion to usurp the sovereignty of that place, and reigned in peace, though without changing his title, from Sinope to the Phasis along the coast of the Black Sea; his grandson, not content with the independence, assumed, as Theodore had done before, the imperial dignity. In Europe also[41] an independent principality was founded by an illegitimate member of the same family, who established himself in Epirus, Ætolia, and Thessaly, but contented himself with the appellation of despot. The first of these three governments will be found to have furnished the immediate agency, in the restoration of the Greek empire after the dominion of the Latins, and all to have contributed to maintain its alienation from the western Christians, and thus to cause it to be abandoned to the Turks.

That the Greek empire should be re-established, appears to have been necessary to the improvement of the western nations. The possession of the Latins, continued during fifty-seven years, was sufficient for communicating to them some admiration at least of the arts of a more improved people, and for connecting the maritime states with the commerce of the eastern capital. If however it had been protracted to the time of the Turkish conquest, without any intervening re-establishment of the former empire, it could

[39] Decline and Fall, &c., vol. vi. pp. 181, 182. [40] Ibid., p. 182.
[41] Ibid., vol. vi. p. 183.

have served only to engage them in a renewed struggle with the infidels for a territory, which they probably would not have been able effectually to defend, and which, if it could have been protected, must have been superfluous and embarrassing to the rising system of the west. Between the expulsion of the Latins and the Turkish conquest of Constantinople an interval was accordingly interposed by the re-establishment of the Greek empire. Nor was this interval, which extended to a hundred and ninety-two years, longer than was expedient for the improvement of the western nations. While the empire of the Latins subsisted, they were yet too barbarous for attaining to more than an admiration of the refinement of art, which had been treasured in the city of Constantine, and it was necessary that much more time should elapse, before the literary stores of that ancient capital could be valued even in Italy.

While the time, thus required for transmitting the refinement of Greece, was furnished by the lingering existence of the restored empire, the alarming dangers, to which it was constantly exposed, served to overcome the resentment, which would else have so increased the alienation of the Greeks, as to have separated them from all communication with the Latins. As the Turks slowly pressed onward to the conquest, which should establish them within the limits of Europe, the Greeks could discover no hope of relief except in the succours of the western Christians. The most urgent solicitations were accordingly employed, and a proposal was repeatedly made, though perhaps a fallacious one, of surrendering the distinctive character and independence of the Grecian church[42]. During these apprehensions and

[42] The separation of the Greek and Latin churches, which had originated in the jealousy of ecclesiastical power, received a distinctive character in the seventh century, when the eighth council of Toledo determined, that the Holy Spirit should be believed to have proceeded from both the Father and the Son. The creed framed in the council of Nice had been directed so exclusively to the condemnation of the doctrine of Arius, that in regard to the third Person of the trinity it contained only this declaration '(we believe) also in the Holy Spirit.' —Socratis Hist. Eccles., lib. i. cap. viii. This part of the Christian doctrine appeared afterwards to require to be rendered more particular, and, for maintaining the dignity of the second Person, the expression 'and from the Son' was in the year 653 introduced by the Spanish council into the creed of the church, immediately after that the Arian

negotiations a favourable opportunity was afforded for the removal both of the teachers, and of the literature of Greece, from that country into Italy, which had been prepared for their reception[43] by the gradual progress of its own improvement, and especially by the genius of its distinguished triumvirate, Dante, Petrarch, and Boccacio.

Michael Palæologus, who had been recently placed upon the throne of Nice, to the prejudice of the lineal heir, and displayed the virtues and vices[44] of the founder of a new dynasty, effected the restoration of his original country with the assistance of the Genoese, who were jealous of the influence of their Venetian rivals with the Latin masters of Constantinople. That this chief was a usurper had the other operation of assisting to maintain the alienation of the Greeks from the Latins. The new emperor was soon excommunicated by the patriarch[45] for the cruelty with which he had blinded the young prince, whose throne he had usurped; and, though at the end of six years the penitent sovereign was restored to religious communion, yet the spirit of the patriarch survived in a powerful party of the monks and clergy, who persevered more than forty-eight years in a schism, occasioned by the degradation and banishment of their unbending chief. The spirit of ecclesiastical separation, which had thus arisen from the usurpation of the throne of Nice, was fostered by the rivalry of Trebizond, which furnished[46] another line of imperial princes, adverse

Goths of Spain had been converted to orthodoxy.—Decline and Fall, &c., vol. iii. p. 551. The other distinctions of the two churches, for the Greeks peremptorily refused to acknowledge the alteration thus made by a Latin council, related to purgatory, the supremacy of the pope, the use of unleavened bread in the eucharist, and transubstantiation, as they were stated in the council of Florence, when an attempt was made to effect a union.—Carranza, p. 618.

[43] 'We may tremble,' says the historian of the Roman empire, vol. vi. p. 417, 'at the thought, that Greece might have been overwhelmed, with her schools and libraries, before Europe had emerged from the deluge of barbarism; that the seeds of science might have been scattered by the winds, before the Italian soil was prepared for their cultivation.' A valuable testimony this of the moral government of the world.

[44] Ibid., pp. 203, 204. [45] Ibid., p. 235. [46] The first prince of Trebizond was the grandson of an emperor of a dynasty, which had been succeeded on the throne by that, with which Theodore of Nice claimed a connexion by marriage.—Ibid., vol. vi. p. 241.

to the reigning family of Constantinople, and therefore favourable to the party opposed to its authority. The European principality also, though at this time subjected to the throne of Constantinople, still maintained so much of its temporary independence, that it protected the hostile synods of the fugitive monks and bishops, who resisted the wishes of their sovereign. In these circumstances the chief concerns of the state were the choice of the patriarch and his management of the church[47]; and, when the spirit of the ecclesiastics had been so much excited, it must have been impracticable to induce them to yield to the supremacy of Rome, the indispensable condition of obtaining assistance from the Latin church.

The distractions of this feeble government prepared it long before for the dominion of the Turks. The dynasty of the Palæologi was in the year 1341 compelled to share its power for a time with a noble, named Cantacuzene, too considerable to remain in the subordinate condition of a subject. From this intrusion it was relieved in the year 1355 by the forced abdication of the new usurper; but the struggle afforded the memorable occasion of introducing the Ottomans into Europe[48]. The emperor and his rival contended alike for the favour of the common enemy, which was, however, gained by the address of Cantacuzene, who even gave his daughter in marriage to the infidel prince.

At this time we find[49] two emperors and three empresses on the throne of Constantinople. Though the usurper was forced to abdicate, the government was incapable of resuming tranquillity and vigour. The empire was contracted

[47] Of the internal state of that church a judgment may be formed from the miserable dispute, by which it was occupied about a century before the reduction of Constantinople, concerning the light manifested to the disciples of our Saviour in the transfiguration. The question had arisen from a visionary persuasion, prevalent among the monks of Athos, at least from the eleventh century, that by persevering in an abstracted contemplation of the middle of the belly, the region of the navel, they could attain to a perception of a mystical and ethereal light. This they maintained to be the same manifestation of the divine nature, which had been vouchsafed to the disciples on mount Tabor; and a synod of the Greek church, in which the emperor Cantacuzene presided, established as an article of faith the acknowledgment of the uncreated nature of the light of mount Tabor.—Decline and Fall, &c., vol. vi. p. 278. [48] Ibid., p. 318. [49] Ibid. p. 274.

to a corner of Thrace[50], between the Propontis and the Black Sea, about fifty miles in length and thirty in breadth. Even this little district it was found necessary to dismember for the purpose of gratifying the various individuals of the reigning family, so that two emperors reigned together over little more than the capital. So dependent was this feeble remnant of a state, that one of the two emperors, with a hundred of the noblest Greeks, was forced to obey a peremptory order, requiring them to serve in the wars of the Turkish sultan[51], and that an attempt to fortify Constantinople was at his desire instantly countermanded. In the beginning of the fifteenth century the empire was indebted for the prolongation of its existence during fifty years, not to any internal resources still possessed, not to any support received from the other Christian states of Europe[52], but to the seasonable interposition of Tamerlane in crushing for a time its formidable enemy.

In the combinations of remote and dissimilar causes it is curious to observe that, as the irruption of a barbarian issuing from the wilds of Tatary arrested and suspended the assault of the Ottomans, so more than a century before had the Greek empire been rescued from the ambition of a European prince by a barbarous conspiracy in the west. When Charles of Anjou had, in the year 1266, possessed himself of the throne of the two Sicilies, the conquest of the feeble empire of Greece became a natural object of his wishes, and he actually engaged in the enterprise with a considerable force[53]. From this project, however, which would have inconveniently brought Greece within the policy of western Europe, he was recalled by the revolution begun with *the Sicilian Vespers*, the Greek emperor[54] assisting with his treasures a diversion so favourable to his safety.

[50] Decline and Fall, &c., vol. vi. p. 328. [51] This title was first assumed by Bajazet I., instead of emir, having received a grant of it by patent from the caliph of Egypt.—Ibid., p. 299. [52] The schism of the west, and the factions and wars of France and England, diverted the western nations from the relief of the Greeks. The Italians were even tempted by present interest, to serve the enemy of their religion; a colony of Genoese in particular, settled on the Ionian coast, was bribed by a lucrative monopoly of alum.—Ibid., p. 368. [53] Ten thousand men at arms, a numerous body of infantry, and a fleet of more than three hundred ships and transports.—Ibid., p. 245. [54] Ibid., p. 246.

One hundred and fifty-two years of the history of the Ottoman government were preparatory to the subversion of the Greek empire. The remaining sixty-seven, of the period comprehended within the present chapter, were employed in extending and establishing the dominion of the conquerors. This latter portion was occupied by three reigns, those of Mohammed II., who effected the conquest, of Bajazet II., and of Selim I.; all worthy successors of the earlier princes, who had created and formed this victorious monarchy.

Mohammed II., in a reign of thirty years, continued a career of success, begun with an achievement so brilliant as the capture of the Grecian capital, effected in the year 1453. Like his father Amurath indeed he failed before Belgrade, but in every other quarter victory attended his arms. All the continental provinces of the Greek empire, with the greater part of the islands, either submitted voluntarily, or were reduced by force; Servia, Bosnia, and Albania were likewise conquered; Caramania, which had ever checked the power of the Ottomans, was by this prince entirely subdued; the Genoese were driven from the Tauric Chersonesus, which was annexed to the dominion of the Turks;[55] and considerable successes were obtained in a war, in which the Persians had been the aggressors. The ambition of the Turkish prince, inflamed by this series of triumphs, was then directed to the attack of the Christians of the west, and a considerable fleet was sent in the year 1480. This was the expedition, in which, as has been already noticed, the power of Turkey was first controlled by the balancing power of Persia. When he had effectually repressed the hostilities, by which he had been recalled from Italy, he

[55] He found there in the year 1471 Mongili Gierai, descended from the Coptchak princes, whom he made khan of the Crimea. —Cantimir, tome ii. p. 27. The Turks at pleasure deposed the khan of the Crimea, but chose his successor from the same family. In the year 1774 the Crimean Tatars became independent by the aid of the Russians, and in the year 1783 they fell under the power of that people. According to the common opinion of the Turks there were two principal branches of the Oguzian tribe, that of the Ottomans and that of the Alijenghizians; and from the latter the khans of the Crimea are believed to have descended in an uninterrupted series. A law was accordingly established by the Ottoman sultans, that, if their race should become extinct, a successor should be chosen from that other family.— Cantimir, pref. xcii.

prepared to subjugate the power, by which they had been waged, but death arrested his course, and transferred the empire to his son Bajazet II.

The character of this prince, comparatively pacific, appears to have been useful in moderating the rage of conquest. His milder temper was in some degree manifested in the very commencement of his reign, by prosecuting a plan of performing a pilgrimage to Mecca, in disregard of the representations of his ministers. His reign, however, though not so brilliant as that of his predecessor, was by no means passed in inactivity. By him[56] was begun the contest with the sovereign of Egypt, which was terminated by his successor in the subjugation of that country; and the measures which he adopted for restraining the Circassians, deprived the Egyptians of that continued supply of slaves, which, under the well-known name of[57] Mamelukes, constituted its military strength. During sixteen years[58] he was successful in all his enterprises; but, having indulged himself[59] during the ten succeeding years in the repose, which had been procured by so many victories, he disgusted the eager spirits of his subjects, and, while he was taking measures for resigning the empire to his eldest son, was deposed by his second son Selim, by whose order he was soon afterwards assassinated, when he had reigned thirty-two years.

Selim I., who ascended the throne in the year 1512, completed the dominion of the Turks by the reduction of Egypt and its dependent territory, effected in the year 1517. His ambition had been, like that of Mohammed II., directed to the conquest of Persia, which he was desirous of accomplishing[60] before he should attempt to conquer Egypt, that he might engage in this other enterprise with greater security. In the war with Persia he was during three years uniformly successful[61]; and, when he had a near prospect of becoming

[56] Cantimir, tome ii. p. 92. [57] The Mamelukes, or rather Mamlouks, were originally a guard of Mongul slaves, their name signifying *slaves*. In the year 1250 they usurped the sovereign power. After 267 years they were reduced by Selim I., emperor of the Turks; and in the year 1811 their beys were massacred by Ali Pasha, the nominal governor, but real sovereign of Egypt. [58] Cantimir, tome ii. pp. 91—98. [59] Ibid., pp. 99, &c. [60] Ibid. p. 176. [61] Ibid., p. 191.

master of the country, the sultan of Egypt offered his assistance. This incident however, which seemed to promise entire and speedy success, eventually delivered Persia, and subjugated Egypt and Syria, an act of violence, committed by the Egyptian soldiery, having given offence to Selim, and determined him to turn his whole force against his auxiliaries. The glory of Selim was completed[62] by the voluntary submission of Mecca, the centre of the religious veneration of all the followers of Mohammed. His ambition was then again directed to the acquisition of Persia; but in this project, which seemed to require only that it should be attempted, he was, like his predecessor, defeated by death. The reduction of Egypt and Syria perfected the combination, by which the ancient intercourse with India was embarrassed, and European adventure driven to the ocean; the subjugation of Persia would have destroyed the countercheck of the Turkish power, which was necessary to the protection of the western countries of Europe.

Though the Ottomans had been a tribe of Tatars, who were distinguished[63] by their reverence for illustrious families, yet, probably in consequence of that long series of military discipline, which must have transformed them into a nation of military adventurers, they became wholly indifferent to the claims of ancestry[64], and thus were directly contrasted to the feudal nations of the west, to which they were opposed. This contrast[65] has been alleged by Busbequius, as that which in his time gave a decisive superiority to the Turkish arms. The energies of a military nation were then, as in our own time, exalted by the abolition of distinctions, which must tend to repress the ardour of enterprise, however they may be favourable to orderly government. From the same source another peculiarity was probably derived, by which the Turks were distinguished from the western nations. Duelling, which, however indefensible in principle,

[62] Cantimir, tome ii. p. 207. [63] Ibid., p. 145. [64] Busbequii Epist. pp. 160, 161. [65] Sic eâ in gente dignitates, honores, magistratus, virtutum et meritorum præmia sunt; improbitas, ignavia, inertia, nullo honore pensantur, jacent, contemnunturque. Ergo illi rebus gestis florent, dominantur, imperii fines quotidie proferunt: apud nos aliis vivitur moribus, virtuti nihil est relictum loci; omnia natalibus deferuntur; opinione natalium omnes honoris aditus occupantur.—Ibid., p. 100.

is connected with a sense of personal honour, was reprobated in the Ottoman empire[66]. The enemies of their religion were the only legitimate objects of the fury of Turks; and, where all distinctions emanated only from the pleasure of the sovereign, no principle of personal honour could urge to a vindictive indulgence of private animosity. Thus destitute of the principle of personal honour, and ignorant of all hereditary pretensions, the Ottomans looked only to their chief for distinction. The government however was not a simple and unqualified despotism, being in some small degree controlled by the Oulemah[67], or body of the church and law, the chief order of which, that of the Moulahs, is hereditary; nor has the standing army, which indeed is but an inconsiderable proportion of the national force, ever proceeded to the deposition of a sovereign, except as it was instigated by that body. Under such a control, the government was fitted, when a sufficient impression had been made upon the feudal establishments of Christendom, to remain stationary, or even to become retrograde, while these were advancing in improvement, and thus to become comparatively ineffective and unimportant, when its activity was not longer required.

The infancy of this nation was not marked with such barbarity, as has stigmatised the earlier history of the Saracens. The immediate successor of Othman was on the contrary distinguished by an anxious desire of establishing seminaries of learning throughout his territory; and when the career of conquest[68] had been suspended, and the Turkish sovereigns had begun to enjoy tranquillity, the ancient rudeness of the national manners entirely disappeared, and the arts of peace, more especially music, were cultivated with success. The Turks[69] also had the entire systems both of

[66] Busbequii Epist., pp. 200, 201. Cantimir, tome ii. p. 167. It was not so however with the Arabs, at least in Spain, for a duel appears to have been fought among them in that country in the year 978. —Hist. de la Domination des Arabes et des Maures en Espagne et en Portugal, tome ii. p. 12. [67] The Mufti however, or chief of this body, may now, says Cantimir, who wrote at the beginning of the eighteenth century, be deposed by the sultan, if his sentence should be disagreeable; and, if he should be deemed guilty of any considerable offence, may be brayed to death in a mortar.—Tome i. p. 115.

[68] Ibid., tome ii. p. 237. [69] Sir James Porter's Observations on the Turks, p. 39. Lond. 1771.

the Aristotelian and of the Epicurean philosophy translated into their language, though the latter was more generally adopted, as being accommodated to present enjoyment[70]. But the political importance of the Oulemâh directed the enquiries of the Turks to the code of their prophet, while the military habits, which the original circumstances of the nation rendered inveterate, alienated them from speculative researches. Painting was specially proscribed by their religion in its abhorrence of idolatrous representations, and the exercise of this art was accordingly confined within very narrow limits. It was permitted[71] to delineate only the hands and feet of their prophet, no portraits being allowed, except only of the sultans, and these being preserved only in the library of the palace, whereas the Persians, less scrupulous, prefixed to their histories portraits, not only of Mohammed, but of other prophets, and of their emperors. Busbequius[72] speaks of the Turks as in his time, or in the sixteenth century, generally disposed to adopt the usages of other nations; but says that they would not admit the typographical art, because their sacred writings would have ceased to be writings, nor public clocks, because these would infringe the authority of some ancient usages. For the opposition made to the introduction of printing in later times another cause has been assigned, the present interest of a numerous class of persons employed in transcription.

The Turks thus appear from the beginning to have acquired from the cultivated Arabs and Greeks the first rudiments of literature and even philosophy, but never to have aspired to any eminence of attainment. Not actuated by the fanaticism of the Arabs, they did not like them reject the first opportunities of improvement; but, less favoured by nature with the gifts of genius, and longer harassed by military enterprises, neither did they seek to crown their successful fortune with the elegance of intellectual refinement. We find among the early sovereigns of the Turks no such character as the Arabian caliph, who saw no necessity for any other book than the koran; but, when these northern Mohammedans became possessed of Greece itself, they did not catch the enthusiasm of learning and art from

[70] Cantimir, tome ii. p. 126. [71] Ibid., pp. 255, 256. [72] Epist., pp. 214, 215.

its sacred relics, as the Arabs had been inflamed by the inferior refinement of the Persians. The function of the Turks was merely political, and to this their character was adjusted. The Arabs had already transmitted knowledge to the west, and the system of Europe at this time required only to be compressed and invigorated by the aggressions of a nation of soldiers, who might drive before them the refinement still treasured in the eastern empire.

The character of retired sanctity, which distinguished the ancestors of Ismail, the first prince of the restored empire of Persia[73], was gradually converted into one of political enterprise, as the donation of Tamerlane had given them importance, and this importance excited jealousy and hostility in the Tatar rulers of the country. The dissensions of those chieftains, who had risen to power on the ruin of the family of Tamerlane, prepared the way, during a distracted period of twenty-six years, for the establishment of a new dynasty. Ismail accordingly, at the age of fourteen years, availed himself of the favourable opportunity for beginning his military operations; and in the year 1502, not four years from the first effort of his arms, the youthful adventurer became the acknowledged sovereign of the kingdom of Persia. The advancement of this prince was favoured by other circumstances, besides the public disorder of the country. Not having been born the chief of a tribe, he was not to other tribes an object of jealousy; and the character of sanctity, which his family had acquired, procured for them almost universal veneration.

The more celebrated of the ancestors of Ismail, who were *souffees*, or philosophical deists, had chosen, as an object more comprehensible to their adherents, to attach themselves to the sect of Ali, from whom they claimed to have descended, and whose wrongs had formed an early division among the followers of Mohammed. The principle of separation, thus adopted to strengthen a party, became, by the advancement of Ismail, the characteristic of the nation, which he governed, a large portion of the people being already attached to it; and as in western Europe the religious opposition of the Protestants and Romanists became in a later period the actuating principle of political equilibrium, so

[73] Sir J. Malcolm's Hist. of Persia, vol. i. pp. 494, &c.

was there at this time formed a balance between the two Mohammedan governments by the contention about the right of succession among the earlier caliphs.

Here we discover the importance of the suppression of the caliphate of Bagdad, which had been effected by the Tatars in the year 1258, or two hundred and forty-four years before the restoration of Persia. If the succession of the caliphs had been still continued in Bagdad, and the acknowledged head of the common religion had thus resided within the territory of Persia, it would have been impossible that the balance of Turkey and Persia could have been maintained on any sectarian principle, for the Persians could not as a nation have disowned the caliphate, which had been so long cherished, and was still existing in their country. This centre of religious union however having been destroyed by the suppression of the caliphate, the two Mohammedan governments might be divided on the question of the succession, which had acquired additional importance in the minds of men, as the power of the existing dynasty declined.

The history of Ismail may be briefly told[74]. Of the twenty-one years of his reign nine appear to have been employed in extending and securing his dominion in some of the provinces of Persia, and in repressing the Usbeg Tatars, who struggled for the possession of Khorassan, the north-eastern district. He was then involved in a contest with the Turkish sultan Selim I., who had invaded his kingdom. From Selim he sustained a complete defeat, probably overpowered by the artillery and military science, which that prince must have received from the Europeans; but the invading army having been forced by a want of supplies to retire from Persia, and the efforts of Selim having been afterwards directed against the Egyptians and Circassians, Ismail was left at liberty to add Georgia to his territories. The king of Persia died in the year 1523, three years after the death of Selim, who by the reduction of Egypt and Syria[75] had completed the empire of Turkey, except only the northern provinces of Walachia and Moldavia.

[74] Sir J. Malcolm, vol. i. pp. 503, 505. [75] Bulgaria had been conquered in the year 1396; Walachia and Moldavia were reduced by Solyman, who succeeded Selim.—Tableau des Révol. de l'Europe, tome ii. p. 164.

CHAPTER XII.

Of the history of commerce, from the commencement of the fourteenth century to the peace of Noyon, concluded in the year 1516.

Woollen manufacture introduced into England in the year 1331—Woollen manufacture in Ireland. Greatest prosperity of the hanseatic league, 1370—The removal of the herring-shoal and the opening of the Zuyder Zee, about 1400—Antwerp considerable in commerce, about 1447—The greater part of the trade of Bruges transferred to Antwerp, about 1487—Indian trade managed by Venice and Genoa. The ascendency of Venice and declension of Genoa begun, 1379—Genoa ceased to rival Venice, 1431—The oriental trade of Genoa destroyed by the reduction of Constantinople, 1453—Maritime communication with India discovered by the Portuguese, 1497—Venice attacked at home by the league of Cambrai, concluded, 1508—Origin of the piratical states of Barbary, 1499—The war of the league of Cambrai terminated by the peace of Noyon, 1516.

At the close of the thirteenth century the principal object in the commercial arrangements of Europe was the hanseatic confederacy, the commencement of which has been referred to the year 1241. This extended association of trading cities connected into one system all the commerce of Europe, maintaining a direct communication between the Rhine and the Baltic, and a circuitous one between the trading cities of Italy and the same sea, the latter communication at the same time supporting the industry and wealth of the Netherlands, since on account of the imperfect state of navigation it was found necessary to use the ports of Flanders, especially Bruges, as intermediate stations. Of the wealth at this time accumulated in Bruges a remarkable anecdote[1] has been recorded by the historian of the Netherlands. Philip the *fair*, king of France, having visited this city with his queen in the first year of the fourteenth century, the latter astonished at the magnificence of the ladies, exclaimed that she had thought that she was the only queen there, but that she had found there more than six hundred.

[1] Anderson, vol. i. p. 144.

The Netherlands formed a conduit of traffic from the cities of Italy, where it had arisen, to the great trading establishments of the other regions of the west. They first conveyed it to the hanseatic towns of Germany; they next introduced capital and manufacturing industry into Great Britain; and it will hereafter be seen, that the prosperity of the Dutch republic was originally received through the same channel of industry and wealth.

The introduction[2] of the first and most important manufacture, that of woollen cloth, into England was the work of Edward III., in the year 1331, having been occasioned by his observation of the extraordinary wealth, which the people of the Netherlands derived from their use of a material principally supplied by his kingdom. The execution of this measure had been facilitated by the circumstances of the manufactures of the continent. The woollen manufacture, first established in Flanders about the year 960, began about the commencement of the fourteenth century to experience the abuses of a monopolising spirit. The result of the struggles and tumults, to which these gave occasion, was that many of the manufacturers, about the year 1331, fled from their own country to England, where they obtained such privileges, as encouraged them to resume their occupation. The industry of the manufacturers of Flanders had generated wealth, which again generated an eager desire of securing an exclusive possession of the manufacture; and the efforts of a restrictive spirit counteracted and frustrated its own purpose, driving to other countries the very art, of which it endeavoured to engross all the advantage. The exemption of England from a similar mischief appears to have been one of the many advantages of its insular situation, which permitted manufacturing industry to seek in the villages a retreat from the oppressions of incorporated towns, without incurring the danger of exposure to foreign hostility. When a considerable number of the Flemish artisans were thus driven from their homes, the determination of a part of them to settle in England was a consequence of the commercial connexion subsisting between the two countries, the manufacturer naturally seek-

[2] Anderson, vol. i. p. 161.

ing the country, which furnished the material of his manufacture.

So rapid was the progress of the manufacture in its new settlement, that in the year 1347[3], or sixteen years from the introduction of the Flemings, we find a duty on exported cloth already established. The cloth however so exported was of the coarser kinds, and the English long continued to procure from the Netherlands the finer fabrics. At length in the year 1399, the manufacture having been brought to a considerable degree of perfection, the importation of all foreign cloth was prohibited. Long after this time however dispensations from this prohibition were occasionally granted, according to the political relations existing between the English and the people of the Netherlands.

Ireland[4] had in the middle of the fourteenth century become celebrated even in Florence for her manufacture of 'noble serges,' which were probably superior to those at present used, as they are described to have been even among the Italians an article of female dress. It appears indeed[5] from a testimony quoted by the late earl of Charlemont from Anderson's History of Commerce, that by the last statute of Edward III. it was enacted, that Irish frizes should not be subject to any duty on importation into England. The trade of the woollen manufacture was continued too with Italy, at least to the close of the following century, and extended to other fabrics besides serges, for the earl has quoted from Rymer's Fœdera a license granted to an agent of the pope in the year 1482, for exporting into Italy certain commodities without paying custom, among which are mentioned five mantles of Irish cloth, one lined with green, and one russet garment lined with Irish cloth. The woollen manufacture of Ireland may have been derived from Italy, as that of England was received from the Netherlands; and the earl was even disposed to conjecture, that Edward III. may have laboured to establish the manufacture among his English subjects, in competition with a trade

[3] Anderson, vol. i. p. 177. [4] This has been proved by the late earl of Charlemont from the following passage of Dittamondi, lib. iv., cap. 26:

Similimente passamo in Irlanda,
Laqual fra noi e degna de fama
Per le nobile saie che ci manda.

Trans. of the Royal Irish Academy, vol. i. Ant. art. 2. [5] Ibid.

then extensively maintained among the Irish. The testimony of the Florentine poet, quoted by the earl, forbids us to believe, that the people of this island were at that time too barbarous for this traffic, since he has told us that, though they might seem savage, they were 'sweet' to those who tried them.[6]

The hanseatic cities, not being conveniently situated for procuring materials[7], could not engage in manufactures; but their association furnished them with the means of conducting the interchange of the coarse and bulky necessaries of the north, and the luxurious accommodations of the south and east. The prosperity established on such a basis was however necessarily transient, for a maritime country, which is possessed of manufactures, will naturally become commercial, and acquire in this other department of industry an ascendency over one, which is destitute of the means of supplying the objects of traffic. We accordingly find that[8], from about the commencement of the fifteenth century, the Netherlands began to rival the hanseatic cities in commerce, partly by the advantage of possessing the woollen manufactures, though also partly by that of possessing the art of pickling herrings, invented, or at least improved, by a Fleming, who died in the year 1397.

The commercial superiority of the Netherlands, derived as it was in part from the trade of herrings, was connected with a remarkable fact in the natural history of Europe, the removal of the great shoal of herrings from one shore to another. This shoal had frequented the southern shore of the Baltic in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries[9]; thence it removed first to the shores of Denmark and Norway, and in the year 1394 to that of Britain. A considerable quantity of herrings however still resorted to the Baltic in the year 1417, though the supply had begun to fail so long before. Nor should it be conceived, that the great manu-

[6] Questa gente, benche mostra selvagia,
E per gli monti la contrada accierba,
Nondimeno l'e dolicie ad cui l'assagia.

In the time of Tacitus the ports of Ireland were more known to the trading Italians, than those of Britain.—Vit. Agric., cap. 24. The same local commodiousness may have continued, or renewed, the intercourse. [7] Anderson, vol. i. p. 255. [8] Ibid., pp. 221, 230.
[9] Ibid., pp. 152, 219, 244.

factures of Europe were at any time confined to the Netherlands. Almost all the richer manufactures continued to be the productions of Italy[10], and even the wool of England was partly conveyed to Venice, Florence, and Genoa[11].

The historian of the hanseatic league has marked the year 1370[12], as the time of its most considerable aggrandisement. It then comprehended sixty-four cities actually members of the confederacy, besides forty-four others which were its allies, but not subject to the ordinary and annual contributions; and at length most of the chief trading cities of Europe entered into its alliance for the reciprocal protection of commerce. The attainment of the greatest prosperity of this celebrated league was soon followed by the commencement of its humiliation. About the year 1403 the king of Denmark, assisted by a naval force belonging to the Netherlands, obtained some decisive advantages over the hanseatic cities, which had almost engrossed the commerce of the Baltic; and the people of the Netherlands from this time gained ground so fast upon the confederacy, that within little more than a century they had actually acquired an ascendency in the trade of the Baltic.

The greatest prosperity of the Netherlands was nearly a century later than that of the hanseatic league, the year 1467 having been that[13], in which they lost their prince, Philip, duke of Burgundy, surnamed the *good*. These provinces were at that time a match for France, weakened as it had been by its wars with England, and by its own internal divisions; but the rashness of the succeeding prince, Charles the *bold*, engaging him in expensive wars, a system of oppressive taxation was adopted, which gradually impaired the prosperity of the Netherlands. As the prosperity of these provinces had been much assisted by a natural event, the migration of the great shoal supplying the herring-fishery, so did another, which occurred about the beginning of the fifteenth century, give occasion to the removal of their whole commerce to the Dutch. An inundation of the sea[14] formed a communication between the ocean and a lake, which has since been denominated the Zuyder Zee, or South Sea, and

[10] Anderson, vol. i. p. 306. [11] Ibid., pp. 188, 240, 264, 292.
[12] Ibid., pp. 200, &c. [13] Ibid., p. 282. [14] Ibid., pp. 247, 261.

thus rendered Amsterdam a seaport. The removal of the herring-shoal, which happened about the same time, gave to the people of this city, thus unexpectedly favoured with a maritime communication, an opportunity of providing a necessary article of supply for the cities of the Baltic, in addition to the salt, which they were also enabled to furnish; and by the possession of these two important objects of trade, they acquired a considerable portion of the commerce of that sea. Bruges in Flanders continued however long after this time to be the great emporium of the northern and southern trades. At length, about the year 1487[15], an outrageous insurrection caused the emperor to attack this city with the assistance of Antwerp and Amsterdam, which were jealous of its commercial superiority. At that time indeed the greater part of the trade of Bruges was removed to Antwerp, which had become considerable about forty years before[16], and but a small portion to Amsterdam, which however afterwards engrossed the trade of both these cities.

The trade of Europe with the east was in the fourteenth century divided between the Genoese and the Venetians[17]. While the Latin empire of Constantinople subsisted, Venice enjoyed such advantages as enabled her almost to monopolise this commerce, which has been in every age the grand source of opulence. The restoration of the Greek empire, effected in the year 1261 by the assistance of Genoa, transferred these advantages to the rival city, and Venice was then compelled to seek at the ancient staples, of which Alexandria was the principal, an opportunity of maintaining her oriental traffic. The trade itself was of increasing importance in the thirteenth century. A variety of causes had augmented the intercourse of the nations of Europe, and the hanseatic league in particular formed a mercantile communication, by which the productions of Asia were extensively distributed through the west. The two commercial rivals thus constituted, in an age of increasing activity of commerce, two distinct mediums for the intercourse of Europe with the east, Genoa trading with India by the Black Sea, and Venice communicating with the same country through Egypt and

[15] Anderson, vol. i. p. 303. [16] Ibid., p. 347. [17] Robertson's Disquisition concerning India, pp. 142, &c.

Syria. The establishment of the Latin empire of Constantinople had afforded to the Venetians a favourable opportunity for engaging largely in this traffic; its subversion, while it drove their industry to seek a new and more convenient channel, introduced the Genoese into the possession of their former advantages, and thus established a rivalry of oriental commerce.

The Indian trade of Genoa long continued to be considerable, but at length that of Venice gained an ascendency. The first shock experienced by the prosperity of Genoa was caused by her own dissensions, in consequence of which it was found necessary[18], in the year 1353, to yield the sovereignty of the republic to the duke of Milan. Twenty years however after this humiliation Genoa was still able to effect the conquest of Cyprus[19], and even individual citizens about the same time engaged in hostilities with the Greek emperor and the emperor of Trebizond. The commencement of its declension, and of the ascendency of Venice, is referred to the year 1379, when the people of the former failed in an attempt to gain possession of the latter city. What this miscarriage began, was completed by the continued dissensions of the Genoese, the republic being in the year 1396 necessitated to solicit the protection of the French government. Though the burthensome acquisition was after fifteen years relinquished by that power, the prosperity of Genoa was irrecoverably lost. She still indeed retained some degree of importance, and even maintained a long contest with the rival state. The last battle was fought in the year 1431, at which time Genoa ceased to be at all a match for Venice. After the French had relinquished the sovereignty of Genoa, it was recovered by the Milanese, and the Genoese even found it necessary to transfer various parts of their territories to their own bank of saint George, for the purpose of procuring for them a more effectual protection, than could be afforded by the state.

When Genoa had acted as an exciting cause of the energies of Venice, and had also served as an organ for transmitting some portion of the spirit and industry of commerce from its early settlement in Italy to the neighbouring kingdom of France, it appears to have discharged the functions

[18] Anderson, vol. i. sub an. [19] Ibid., p. 203.

of its independent existence. Its agitations then drove into France its numerous exiles, with their arts and industry, and the republic sunk into insignificance.

The reduction of Constantinople by the Turks put an end to the oriental commerce of Genoa[20], and Venice was left to enjoy this valuable commerce without a competition, until the circumnavigation of Africa proved as fatal to her prosperity, as the victory of the Turks had been to that of her rival. As the same causes, which had rendered this trade progressive in the preceding century, continued to operate, the eastern commerce, thus engrossed by Venice, must have been very considerable, however inferior to the traffic of more modern times. The augmentation of the supply of the precious metals, by which the trade with India has been chiefly maintained, appears to have been furnished to the Venetians, for this extension of their oriental commerce[21], by the mode in which it was maintained. Venice traded, not with India, but with Egypt, or with Syria, for the productions of India; and, as both these countries, especially Egypt, the chief mart of Indian goods, were destitute of many of the accommodations supplied by the industry of Europe, an opportunity was afforded of conducting much of the Indian trade by a barter of commodities. A regular supply of the precious metals was at all times furnished by the mines of Germany, discovered soon after the middle of the tenth century; the intermediate commerce, maintained with Egypt and Syria, hindered the extension of that of India from too much draining Europe of the necessary medium of its commercial circulation. This indeed may be thought to have transferred the difficulty from the Venetians to those, with whom they immediately traded; it must however, in so doing, have had the operation of exciting their industry to procure from other regions that additional supply of the precious metals, which had become necessary in the extension of the commerce of India.

It is interesting to observe how this considerable trade of the Venetians was gradually pressed and embarrassed by the encroachments of Turkey, as the time was approaching, in which the commercial system of the world was to be changed, the ocean being opened to the enterprise of man. The vi-

[20] Anderson, vol. i. p. 121. [21] Robertson's Disquisition, p. 159.

cinity of the Turkish power began to be troublesome to the Venetians so early as in the year 1419[22], its conquests in Greece being then extended to the Adriatic, and consequently to the neighbourhood of some of the dependencies of Venice. When a period had been put to the Greek empire by the reduction of Constantinople, the Venetians were speedily stripped of their numerous possessions in the islands and the continent of Greece[23], and compelled to pay an annual tribute for permission to navigate the Black Sea. About twenty-one years after that event[24], or about the year 1474, when the Turks had become masters of the Crimea, and had finally driven the Genoese from the Black Sea, they turned their arms against the Venetian territories on the eastern side of the Adriatic, and both at this time, and in the year 1481, possessed themselves of several places in those provinces. Thus, while the Portuguese were pushing along the shore of the ocean their enterprises of discovery, which were begun in the year 1410, the Turks were repressing and reducing the great trading nation of the Mediterranean, taking from it, one after another, its transmarine dependencies, and obstructing in succession its several avenues of commerce.

The trade of Venice however, though pressed by the Turks[25], was notwithstanding in a state of very great prosperity a very short time before this important revolution was effected. As long as the Mediterranean was the grand scene of commercial industry, Venice was of all cities the most fortunately situated, placed as it was in the centre of the trading world, the sea entering into its streets, and the rivers, which flow into that sea, affording channels for the easy distribution of its merchandise. Genoa having sunk into decay, Venice at this time possessed the whole trade of the east, which was then in some particulars even more extended than at present, spices being then more generally consumed,

[22] Anderson, vol. i. p. 245. [23] They, about the year 1473, acquired Cyprus, which they held with great advantage about ninety-five years. They again obtained possession of the Morea in the year 1687, but lost it in the year 1715.—Ibid., pp. 274—278. Candia, or Crete, they held until the year 1670, when it was taken by the Turks after a contest of twenty-four years. Negropont also belonged to the Venetians to a late period.—Pinkerton, vol. i. p. 466. [24] Anderson, vol. i. p. 274. [25] Hist. de la Ligue de Cambray, tome ii. pp. 254, &c.

sugar being imported from Egypt[26], a part of which had been brought from India, and pearls and precious stones being then exclusively oriental commodities. Nor was the wealth of Venice limited to that, which foreign commerce might supply. The fertility of her territory furnished a superfluity, which was eagerly purchased by the inhabitants of the mountainous districts in her neighbourhood: her abundant salt-works gave her a supply of a very necessary article, which her power converted into a monopoly[27]: and, though the manufacture of wool also flourished in Florence, and had been introduced into the Netherlands and other countries, yet, a considerable portion of this species of manufactures, together with those of a finer and richer description, was still peculiarly her own; the manufacture of mirrors and other works of white glass, that of velvets and brocaded silks, and that of scarlet cloths, superior in their texture and their colour, existed only at Venice. Such were the resources of a traffic, which had drawn into Italy all the gold of Europe, and which enabled the Venetian republic to expend in the memorable struggle of the league of Cambrai five millions of crowns of gold[28], a sum estimated by the historian to have been equivalent to ten millions of Spanish pistoles in the beginning of the eighteenth century. But it is a very curious fact, that all this commercial prosperity failed to generate a literary spirit among the Venetians. The Florentines were literary amidst manufacturing industry and the engagements of commerce[29], because every intellectual

[26] Hist. de la Ligue de Cambray, tome ii. p. 262. [27] The Venetians took possession of the salt works within their reach, as those of Cervia; in the year 1381 they obliged the king of Hungary to destroy those which he had in Croatia and Dalmatia, giving him as an indemnity an annual pension of seven thousand crowns of gold; and in the year 1403 they constrained the lord of Ferrara to discontinue the preparation of salt at Commachio.—Ibid., p. 267. [28] The Venetians in the most urgent distresses of the republic always respected commerce, and therefore never augmented the duties imposed on merchandise. Their resources for maintaining the war, as they have been detailed by Cardinal Bembo, consisted in the sale of many offices, in loans voluntary or forced, and in deducting the greater part of the salaries of all offices and employments. Of these the loans were the principal, and the public credit was supported by a faithful payment of the interest. Ibid., tome ii. pp. 271—273. [29] The Florentines in the year 1422, having lately acquired by purchase the dominion of Leghorn,

faculty was excited to activity by the restlessness of a popular and unsettled government; but the Venetians, under the tranquil domination of a jealous aristocracy, were dull amidst all their industry and opulence, contented to seek a trading profit by publishing the works of others, but not themselves contributing to increase the stores of literature[30]. Wealth may reward and encourage the efforts of genius, but political agitation furnishes its strong excitement.

In the year 1497 the Portuguese discovered that maritime communication with India, which was sure to be destructive of the prosperity of Venice, by cutting off the most valuable of its resources. The Venetian senate perceived the impending ruin, and prepared to avert it by the assistance of the sultan of Egypt; but in the year 1508 began the movements of the confederation formed at Cambrai, to humble the pride of the commercial republic, and precisely during the war of eight years, which was the result of that confederacy, the efforts of the Portuguese to acquire dominion in India were crowned with success, and Venice was stripped of the commerce of the east.

The league of Cambrai has been already considered in its relation to the political interests of Europe[31], as it formed the transition, by which the principles and habits of a federative policy, which had been devised by Lorenzo de' Medici for the protection of Florence, were so extended as to comprehend within their operation all the more considerable governments of Europe. It now presents itself to us in another view, as constituting the crisis of the republic, which had chiefly managed the commerce of the world under its earlier arrangements, disabling it for offering any effectual opposition to a change of those arrangements ruinous to its interests. We may justly admire an adaptation of the political agencies of this interesting period to the production of two results so different, as the extension of the newly invented system of a federative policy, and the seasonable depression of a trading government, which would have ob-

entered into a participation of the lucrative trade of Alexandria. But the principal sources of the riches of the Medici are believed to have been the commercial banks, which they had established in almost all the trading cities of Europe.—Roscoe's Life of Lorenzo de Medici, vol. i. pp. 136, 137. [30] Ibid., p. 124. [31] Chapter I. of this book.

structed the extension of the commercial arrangements of the world. Our admiration must be much increased, when we consider that these two results, so different in their natures, and so destitute of all direct connexion, appear however to have been combined as parts of one comprehensive plan of the moral government of the world. The federative system, which has been established in the more modern ages, was a combination, in which the influence of extended commerce and distant colonisation was an important principle; and therefore that other operation of the league of Cambrai, which facilitated the enterprises of the Portuguese, was conducive to the success of its primary agency, by which it propagated from the petty states of Italy to the larger governments of Europe the relations and combinations of a federative policy. The schemes of human policy, like the little processes of human art, are adjusted to the attainment of some single purposes; but the combinations of the divine government, like the operations of the natural world, are comprehensive and various, and manifest the greatness of the Being, by whom they are conducted. The same ethereal fire, which wings in the heavens the lightning and the storm, supplies on the earth the pervading principle of activity and life: the same seas, which at once separate, and yet connect the several regions of the world, furnish by their evaporations the copious streams, which spread fertility and beauty over its surface: the same power, which retains in their places our own and the surrounding bodies, heaves the tides of the ocean, controls the planetary movements, brings back the wandering comet from his distance, and probably extends through all the splendid infinitude of creation, which confounds the gaze of the astronomer.

To the war, which humbled and enfeebled Venice, must be added, as afterwards contributing to reduce the commerce of the Mediterranean, and to stimulate the formation of a new and more extended system of maritime intercourse, the establishment of the piratical states of Barbary, those hordes of authorised banditti, whose existence has disgraced the civilisation of modern times, but who have yet borne their unconscious part in the advancement of the general improvement. The origin of these states has been referred

to the year 1499[32], in which the king of Spain drove into Africa many thousands of his Moorish subjects. Excited at once by necessity and by revenge, the exiled Moors were well disposed to practise piracy against the people, from whom they had been expelled; the plunder of the riches of America, soon afterwards acquired by the Spaniards, rendered this practice particularly lucrative; and the wild habits of a piratical life, first contracted in these enterprises against the Christians of Spain, were afterwards indulged indiscriminately against all Christian nations navigating the Mediterranean. A corsair[33], surnamed Barbarossa from the colour of his beard, gave consistency and form to the principal of the piratical communities, which bade defiance to the order and industry of mankind[34]. Having been in the year 1516 invited by a king of Algiers to give assistance in taking a fort, which the Spanish governors of Oran had built not far from his capital, he murdered the monarch and took possession of his kingdom. Barbarossa was two years afterwards defeated and slain by a force, which the emperor Charles V. had despatched, to enable the governor of Oran to punish his devastations; but his brother, favoured by the war, which occupied the states of Europe, established the order of the government, extended his territory, and placing his dominions under the protection of Turkey, received from the Grand Signior a body of Turkish soldiers sufficient for his security, and by the assistance of that power was enabled in the year 1535 to possess himself of Tunis, the most flourishing kingdom at that time on the coast of Africa. The hostile positions of Turkey were thus extended from the Adriatic to the Strait of Gibraltar, everywhere presenting hostility to the Christians.

[32] In a narrative of Ten Years' Residence at Tripoli, lately published in London, it is however stated, that about the year 1400 three different bands of soldiers, under the protection of the Grand Signior, settled at Tripoli, Tunis, and Algiers; and that from them these kingdoms sprang —p. 5. [33] Robertson's Charles V., vol. iii. p. 97. Lond. 1774.

[34] The other states are Tripoli on the east, and Morocco on the west. The emperor Charles V. took Tripoli, and resigned it to the knights of Malta. These soon lost the possession, but their proximity suppressed the piracy of the Tripolitans. The harbours of Morocco are so blocked up with sand, that it ceased of itself to be a maritime or piratical power.—Pinkerton, vol. ii. pp. 739, &c.

The Turkish dominions pressed very closely on the Venetian republic, in that part of the frontier which bordered the Adriatic; and, as Istria and Dalmatia were reduced to a state of extreme barbarism, it may be worthy of some attention to consider how it happened, that piratical states, much more formidable by their close vicinity, were not established in those provinces. A late traveller has remarked a peculiarity in the population, which appeared to him to have been the cause, why no such communities had been formed there. He has informed us[35], that there are two classes of savage people in Dalmatia, which have never had any intercourse; and he has observed that it was fortunate for the Venetians, that a union of them had never been effected, as it would have constituted a more terrible nation of pirates in the Adriatic, than those of Algiers and Tripoli in the Mediterranean. One of these tribes is composed of the original inhabitants, degraded into misery and savageness by the successive oppressions of the ancient and modern Italians and of the Turks; of the other, all which can now be collected is, that it was a distinct nation, forced into that country by some unknown political event. It seems to have been necessary that the frontier country, which lay between the Christian nations and the Turks, should be reduced to a deplorable state of barbarous weakness, that they might

[35] Travels in Istria and Dalmatia, by M. Cassas, part i. in Mod. and Contemp. Voyages, vol. i. Lond., 1805. The two tribes are named Uscoques and Morlachians. The appellation of the former is derived from *scoco*, signifying an emigrant. They are composed of those, who by the tyranny of successive rulers have been forced to become fugitives, until they were so numerous as to constitute a distinct class of people, sufficiently powerful to avenge themselves on their tyrants the Turks. Some have supposed that the Morlachians were originally natives of Albania, and were odious to the Uscoques, because the Albanians had been their greatest enemies, while others attribute the enmity of the Uscoques to their desire of engrossing all spoil. From their dialect they seem to be more nearly allied to the Bulgarians than to the Albanians; and a district of Croatia, which borders the southern part of the Gulf of Venice between Istria and Dalmatia, bears the name of Morlachia. The Morlachians are dispersed generally throughout Dalmatia, but are found principally on the mountains in the interior of that country. In the other provinces of the western empire the barbarians appear to have united with the original inhabitants in forming new nations; but in Dalmatia the barbarian invaders were probably too barbarous.

be placed at a distance sufficient for preventing perpetual interference; but it is an extremely curious circumstance that the provinces lying near to the Venetians, should be inhabited by two distinct nations of barbarians, which should mutually counteract and neutralise their violence, and thus each hinder the other from being fatally mischievous to a commercial state, which was still important as an organ of the commerce of the continent of Europe.

A political writer of some eminence has intimated[36], that he was not a little inclined to assent to an opinion, that the discovery of America would have been more beneficial to Europe, if it had been deferred to a later period. The new objects of industry would then, he was disposed to think, have presented themselves in their natural order, when the domestic resources of Europe had been improved to their greatest perfection; and that kind of revolution, which has been a consequence of the inversion of this natural order, would have been precluded. This very writer has indeed maintained, that this great event, even as it happened, was highly beneficial to the social existence, and contributed in a very important degree to the improvement and welfare of Europe. His doubt is only whether these interests might not have been more effectually benefited by a delay of the discovery.

It is however to be observed that Robertson has adopted from Raynal a remark, from which it may be inferred that the discovery of America could not have been usefully delayed. It is, say these writers[37], to the discovery of the passage to India by the Cape of Good Hope, and to the vigour and success, with which the Portuguese prosecuted their conquests, and established their dominion in that country, that Europe has been indebted for her preservation from the most illiberal and humiliating servitude that ever oppressed polished nations. The Turkish power had gradually pressed upon the nations of Europe, and within a few years after the circumnavigation of Africa was established in Egypt and Syria, interposing itself between those nations and the commerce of the east. The monarchs too, who in this period governed the empire of the Turks, were eager

[36] Gentz on the State of Europe before and after the French Revolution, p. 367. Lond. 1803. [37] Disquis. concerning India; pp. 221, &c

to avail themselves of the advantages of this position to depress and ruin their adversaries, and well qualified to exert powerful efforts for the attainment of their object. If then this government had been permitted to hold an exclusive possession of the trade of India, and to acquire such a naval power, as the possession of that trade could not fail to create and support, Europe must have sunk beneath its baleful ascendency, and its civilisation and improvement must have been suppressed and destroyed. But if the naval communication with India, was thus critically necessary to the interests of Europe, the discovery of America could not have been delayed without detriment to those interests, since the precious metals of the new world had then become necessary to the commerce of the old, so that the discovery of De Gama must have been of much less value without that of Columbus. Indeed the discovery of America could scarcely be considered as an unconnected event, depending on the enterprise of any individual, Brazil having been accidentally discovered by the Portuguese in sailing to India, only eight years after the first discovery of Columbus, and but four after he had first visited the American continent.

It may however well be questioned, whether that was indeed the natural order of events, for which this writer would wish that the discovery of America had been postponed. In all countries[38] manufactures and foreign commerce have been anticipated, and have contributed to augment agricultural labour, instead of deriving their origin from the highly-improved state of rural industry, and the consequent superabundance of rude produce. That should be considered as the natural order of events, in which it appears from experience that man by the law of his nature is determined to act, not that, according to which we may theoretically suppose, that they should be produced; and the full maturity of domestic industry should therefore be sought as a consequence of the establishment of the colonial system, uniting under the same government countries differing in climate and commodities, and thus providing an opportunity of an interchange, rather than expected as the natural and most useful preparation for a regular and gra-

[38] Brougham's Inquiry into the Colonial Policy of the European Powers, vol. i. p. 144.

dual expansion of the energies of commerce. The manufacturing industry of Europe had at this time attained to a considerable degree of prosperity. It had spread from Italy, its original country, to the Netherlands, attracted by the demands of France; and from the Netherlands it had again been extended to England, whither it was drawn by the possession of the raw material of the great manufacture of wool, which had been chiefly furnished by this country. But in this condition it might long have remained, if a cheaper supply of the luxuries of India had not stimulated the people of Europe to provide a still greater quantity of manufactured goods, that they might be more generally enabled to procure them, and if these goods had not found in America, a new market, in which the precious metals might be obtained to effect the purchases of the east, as well as to manage the domestic operations of the augmented commerce of Europe.

The adaptation of Portugal to the function of effecting the first establishment of Europeans in Hindostan may appear from these considerations; that the strength of the Mohammedan establishments existing in that country required, that the first enterprises of Europeans should be undertaken by a people rather military than commercial, and that, as a military people could not be well qualified to improve its conquests to commercial purposes, it was expedient that this people should not be very powerful, so that it might afterwards without much difficulty be stripped of its acquisitions by another nation more commercial than military. Portugal accordingly had in the long wars of Spain been rendered, not only military, but specially and enthusiastically hostile to the Mohammedans, while its situation adjacent to the Atlantic naturally disposed its people to engage in maritime adventure, though, on account of their military character, to but an inconsiderable degree in the pursuits of commerce. Its secondary importance on the other hand, as it was afterwards brought under the temporary ascendency of Spain in the union of the two governments, afforded to the Dutch republic a favourable opportunity, for converting the conquests of Portugal into establishments more properly commercial.

The case of the American acquisitions of Spain was in

every respect different from that of the Indian acquisitions of Portugal. No formidable resistance was to be encountered, nor was any lucrative commerce to be established. The imperfectly civilised tribes of Mexico and Peru could require no enthusiastic exertion of valour, for effecting the conquest of extensive regions, nor could they furnish commodities for any considerable trade. The object to be attained in this case was the direct revenue, which might be procured from mines in the possession of an unimproved and weak people. That the supply of the precious metals, thus procured, might be generally distributed over Europe, it was obviously advantageous, that it should be primarily furnished to a people comparatively destitute of manufacturing industry. Spain since the subjugation, and more especially after the expulsion of the Moors[39], had lost her manufactures, and was accordingly prepared to become such an organ of the general system. That country was also qualified for the function by its magnitude and strength; for, though no very powerful effort was necessary for achieving its American conquests, yet a people of primary importance in the European system was necessary for the preservation of acquisitions so attractive to the avidity of the rest. The function was not of a nature so temporary as that of Portugal, and was therefore to be discharged by a state, the magnitude and strength of which gave it a principal share of importance.

The appropriation of a portion of southern America to the Portuguese, in the casual discovery and possession of Brazil, appears to have enabled them, by its supplies of treasure, to maintain their trade with India, as long as they retained settlements in that country; to have afterwards given them strength to support the independence, which they resumed under the family of Braganza, after the dissolution of the union with Spain; and finally to have furnished an asylum for their government, when the power and violence of France should have overrun the peninsula, and the British empire should take its place in fighting the battles of Europe.

[39] Spain however, even in the year 1526, had a manufacture of woollen cloth, for which a liberty of passage through France was stipulated in the treaty of Madrid, concluded by Charles V. with Francis I., then his prisoner.—Anderson, vol. i. p. 357.

By the treaty of Noyon, concluded in the year 1516 between France, Spain, and the empire, the war was terminated, which had arisen from the league formed at Cambrai for the reduction of Venice. The republic[40] recovered by that treaty all her possessions on the mainland of Italy, except some towns of little importance in Romagna, and some ports in the Neapolitan territory, which she had held in pledge; but the war of the league of Cambrai had nevertheless exhausted her actual resources, and destroyed much of the means, by which these might have been repaired. The manufacturing establishments formed within her own territory had been almost ruined by the war; Julius II. had forced the Venetian merchants to share with the directors of his own salt-works erected at Cervia, the monopoly of salt, which they had long enjoyed throughout Italy; and the conquest of Egypt, just then effected by the Turks, cut them off from their commercial intercourse with that country, which had been the most considerable source of their opulence. Venice continued to be the centre of the interior commerce of Europe; but it was from this time rather the general bank for managing pecuniary negotiations, than the emporium for the transactions of trade.

CHAPTER XIII.

Of the history of learning, from the commencement of the fourteenth century to that of the papacy of Leo X. in the year 1513.

Dante began his Divina Commedia, in the year 1301—Petrarch born 1304—Boccacio, the father of Italian prose, born, 1313—Greek literature revived in Italy, and Italian literature neglected, in the fifteenth century—Italian literature recovered by Lorenzo de Medici—French poetry fallen into decay, 1310—Chaucer, the first English poet, born before the middle of the fourteenth century—English poetry neglected after him—Dunbar, a Scotish poet, born, 1465—The philosophy of Plato, introduced with Greek literature, was formerly revived in Italy about the middle of the fifteenth century by Cosmo de Medici.

In the commencement of the fourteenth century the verna-

[40] Hist. des Répub. Italiennes par Sismondi, tome xiv., pp. 418, 419.

cular poetry of Europe had acquired a distinct character, and a very general celebrity. The similarity of the languages, which prevailed in the southern provinces of France and in Italy, and the frequent communication between these countries, had introduced among the Italians the poetry of Provence; and so favourably was it received in their numerous courts, and so eagerly was it imitated by native writers, that Tiraboschi begins his history of the poetry of Italy in the fourteenth century[1] with remarking, that it was then scarcely possible to acquire the character of a learned man, without giving attention to the art of poetical composition. The poets of Italy[2] began soon after the middle of the twelfth century to compose poetry in the language of Provence, and continued the practice through the greater part of the thirteenth, though the Sicilians had already presented to the Italians the example of imitating those of Provence in the language of their own country. The example of the Sicilians was however at length imitated; the language of Italy by degrees prevailed over the kindred dialect of the neighbouring country[3]; and the reign of Charles, the first of the French monarchs of Naples and Sicily, which was begun in the year 1266, has been marked as the epoch of the neglect of the Provençal poetry in the Italian peninsula.

But whatever rude attempts may have been previously made, Dante[4], who commenced his celebrated poem[5] in the very beginning of the fourteenth century, is universally regarded as the true father of Italian poetry. This eminent writer[6] was well acquainted with all the learning of his age, being a distinguished philosopher and theologian; and he has accordingly introduced into his Divine Comedy a great variety of learned disquisitions. His display of learning

[1] Storia della Poesia Ital. tomo ii. pp. 4, 5. Lond., 1803. [2] Ibid., p. 15. [3] Ibid., p. 37. [4] The name of the poet was properly Durante, of which Dante was a diminutive appellation, given in infancy. —Ginguené, tome i. p. 438. [5] Seven cantos of the Divine Comedy were composed in Florence before his exile, which occurred in the year 1301; the remainder in his wanderings.—Ibid., pp. 450, 481, 482.

[6] In a prose work, to which he has given the name *Convivo* or *Convito*, he has strongly expressed the delight, which he experienced in the acquisition of learning. 'Happy,' says he, 'are the few, who sit at the table, where men are nourished with the bread of angels, and unfortunate are they, who have a common nutriment with brutes.'—Ibid., p. 470.

may in our judgment detract from the merit of his poetry, but in his time it acquired for him the admiration of scholars, and probably, more than the charms of his verse, procured for him the extraordinary honour of having professorships established in the several universities of Italy, for the exposition of his great work. To us he is interesting only as a poet; and, that we may form a just conception of the transcendent merit, which he possessed in this character, the historian of Italian poetry[7] desires us to consider, what was its condition just before this master composed a poem, which has commanded the admiration of all succeeding ages. An assemblage of rhymes, says he, feebly expressing frigid sentiments of love or morality, was all which Italy could boast, before he tried the powers of his genius. He first knew how to animate the language and the sentiment of poetical composition. His perfections it is to this day difficult to imitate, while his deficiencies are imputable rather to the age in which he lived, than to himself.

At once ardent, melancholy, and abstracted, Dante appears to have been formed by nature to rule with an overbearing sway the imaginations and the feelings of his species, and to make an impression on their sentiments and language, which should endure for ages. Nor did he content himself with proceeding in the path, which had been already opened for him by those, who had begun to write in the dialect of his country. He imitated their example, and availed himself of their assistance; but he sought a nobler instrument, and conceived a higher strain of genius; and in creating the modern poetry he may be said to have also created the modern language of Italy.

A few thoughts[8] turned into a thousand different forms, low and vulgar expressions, a tiresome monotony and prolixity, harshness of versification, and ill-adapted rhymes, are, according to Tiraboschi, the prevailing characters of the Provençal poetry. Formed without the aid of the classic productions of antiquity, it derived no beauties from a chaste representation of natural sentiment; and, being the creature of the feudal courts of the French provinces, it was equally removed from the contemplation of the genuine objects of nature. Nor could the language prove superior to the

[7] Storia della Poesia Ital., tomo ii. pp. 37, 38. [8] Ibid., tome i. p. 36.

thoughts, which it communicated, and the graces of expression were almost unknown. From such a source however, it was necessary that the vernacular poetry of modern Europe should take its origin. If the writers of that time had studied and admired the classics of antiquity, they would have shrunk with disdain from the rude dialect of their contemporaries; if they had not lived in the artificial society of courts, they must have been unqualified to bestow upon its rudeness the first polish, which it received. It was necessary however, that another source should afterwards unite its stream with that, which flowed from the Provençal fountain, before the full current of poetry could be poured over Italy. The study of the ancient models of composition, which would have suppressed the first tendency towards forming a vernacular literature, afforded it most valuable assistance, when it had been so far indulged as to encourage a hope, that poetical expression might be attained in modern language.

Dante[9] has declared, that Virgil was his master and his model, and that he had learned from this great ancient the style, which had procured him honour. Such indeed was his admiration of classical literature, that he began to compose his celebrated work in the language of Virgil, though he soon discontinued his Latin composition, probably because his work would not be generally intelligible. But, though he manifested this profound deference for the poetic authority of the Latin bard, it must not be supposed that he did not also receive some assistance from the *troubadours*, besides the mere example of vernacular composition. Some of these he has honoured with warm eulogies in his great poem; in his tract *de vulgari eloquentiâ* he has represented Thiebault, king of Navarre, as a model for poets; and in two remarkable instances he exercised his genius in composing in the language of Provence. The language of modern Italy he formed for himself. Though it had begun to receive a distinct character about a century before the time of Dante, it was still so rude and unfashioned, that he saw rea-

[9] In the speech, with which the poet addresses Virgil, when he meets him in the infernal regions, he says,

Tu se io mio maestro, e'l mio autore:
Tu se solo colui, da cu' io tolsi
Lo bello stile, che m'a fatto onore.

son for rejecting[10] all the existing dialects, as unfit to be the standard of vernacular expression, and to acknowledge only an ideal form, composed of all which was common to each separate mode of speech, and separated from all their peculiarities. Such was his confidence in the result of this modification of the language[11], that he distinctly predicted the ascendency, which it would speedily attain, describing it as a new sun, which should soon appear above the horizon, and give light to those, on whom the light of ancient latinity no longer shone.

The circumstances of the life of this great poet were all such, as favoured the development of his peculiar genius. Like the poets, who had preceded him, and like Petrarch, who followed him, his muse was fostered by love; but the love of Dante was his own, distinct and appropriate. It was not, like those of his predecessors in Italian poetry[12], a vapid refinement of imagined passion, destitute of the truth of natural feeling; not like that of the *troubadours*, their models, a display of the sentiments of a commonplace, and often of a licentious gallantry; nor yet, like that of Petrarch, an almost platonic admiration of an unattainable, but a real and living object. At the early age of nine years[13] he conceived for his beloved Beatrice an attachment, which was strengthened in his progress towards manhood; when both had arrived at maturity, she was torn from his hopes by death, and a passion so long cherished was spiritualized by a calamity, which in his mind invested its object with a saintly character; and, though he sought consolation in another engagement, his actual experience of a conjugal life served but to give a strong relief to the ideal forms of happiness, which he had pictured in his imagination round the fair vision of his Beatrice. While the kindly affection of his nature was thus excited and elevated, his irritability was exasperated by the disasters of his fortune. Banished from his country for having endeavoured to rescue it from the

[10] The Tuscans even then pretended to a superior purity of language; but Dante reproached them with modes of expression base and corrupted as their morals. The dialect of Bologna he was disposed to prefer to the rest, perhaps in compliment to the poet Guido Guinizzelli, one of the best of the thirteenth century.—Ginguené, tome i. pp. 477, 478.

[11] Ibid., p. 474. [12] Ibid., p. 435. [13] Ibid., p. 440.

dominion of a foreign master[14], he ate in exile with a haughty indignation[15] *the bitter bread* of dependence, and composed his celebrated poem in such a restless change of residence, that almost as many cities claimed the honour of its nativity[16], as among the ancient Greeks pretended to have given birth to the author of the Iliad and the Odyssey.

Soon after the death of Beatrice[17], Dante composed a sort of romance named *Vita Nuova*, in which he recounted all the circumstances of their affection; but feeling that this was not a monument worthy of the memory of her, whom he had so loved, he concluded it with saying that, if he should live a few years, he would say of her such things, as had never been said of woman. In the Divine Comedy he fulfilled this promise. Confounded with a personification of theology, the idol of his early love succeeds as his guide through the regions of purification and of happiness, when the pagan poet, whom he admired and imitated, had conducted him through the tortures of the damned. His poem at the same time was the repository of all his learning, and the record of all his resentments. Displaying the abundance of that scholastic learning, which was then considered as comprehending all human wisdom, exhibiting with the keenest sarcasm the men, who had recently moved on the stage of political life[18], and delighting the imagination with all the beauties of picturesque description, and with the charms of that moral sensibility, which by sympathetic influence awakens all the kind and virtuous affections of our

[14] Charles of Valois, whom pope Boniface VIII. had invited into Italy, that he might drive from Sicily the young Frederic of Aragon, who had been chosen king of the Sicilians in opposition to Charles II. of Naples.—Ginguené, tome i. p. 444, 446. [15] In the Divine Comedy his ancestor thus predicts the suffering of the poet:

Tu proverai si come sadi sale
Lo pane altrui, e com' è duro calle
Lo scendere e'l salir per l'altrui scale.

[16] Florence claims to have been the place, in which the first seven cantos were composed; Verona advances a similar pretension in regard to the greater part of the poem; Gubbio proves a title to some portion; others assign, as the birthplace of the Divine Comedy, the city of Udina, a castle in Friuli, or Ravenna.—Ibid., p. 450. [17] Ibid., p. 466. [18] Seizing on the religious feeling of his contemporaries, he fixed as the time of his vision the last year of the thirteenth century, in which the pontiff had proclaimed a plenary remission of sin to all, who should perform a pilgrimage to Rome.—Edinb. Rev., No. lx.

nature, it addressed itself with resistless power to all, because all could be gratified either with learning, with invective, with natural imagery, or with moral sentiment. The Divine Comedy was not thus denominated as a dramatic composition, but probably[19] because it was designed to be composed in that middle style of writing, which the poet himself considered as suitable to this species of the drama, being intermediate between the tragic, or sublime style, and the elegiac, or plaintive. It is not indeed accommodated to any of the regular forms of composition, but appears to have been the almost unstudied expression of a mind stored with all the learning of the time, acutely sensible of injury, proudly disdainful of insult, animated with the most vivid conceptions of every surrounding object, and elevated by a passion purified from every grosser sentiment.

This great poem was scarcely given to the world[20], when it became an object of general attention and admiration throughout Italy. Not only were copies immediately multiplied without number, but many persons in the very same age hastened to explain its obscurities by commentaries, and public lectureships were established for expounding it, first in Florence, and afterwards in other towns of Italy. The philosophy and theology, with which this work abounded, probably recommended it to its academic honours; but its gloomy and satiric character seems to have been the principal cause of its immediate and universal popularity. Harassed as the people of Italy had been by domestic wars, and agitated as they still were by the violence of political party, they were most deeply interested by a poem, which, professing to reveal[21] the secrets of the unseen world, exhibited sarcastic delineations of all the distinguished persons recently deceased. Perhaps it would not be possible to conceive a species of composition better fitted to arrest and engage the

[19] Ginguené, tome i. p. 446, note. [20] Storia della Poesia Ital., tomo ii. pp. 38, 39, 46—49. [21] The question of the originality of Dante, in the composition of his celebrated poem, has been well considered in the sixtieth number of the Edinburgh Review. The writer of that essay appears to have with good reason rejected the conjectures, which would degrade his genius, and to have truly described him as influenced in the structure of the Divine Comedy only by the prevailing spirit of his age, from which he adopted a visionary mythology, as the machinery of his poetical conceptions.

general attention in such circumstances, and consequently to impress the minds of the people of Italy with a deep conviction of the resources of their language.

Florence, which had given birth to Dante, was also the residence of the parents of Petrarch, though he was born at Arezzo, and passed much of his life at Avignon, or in its vicinity. This father of the lyric poetry of modern Italy was born in the year 1304, seventy-nine years later than his great precursor. At this distance of time it was desirable that another poet should succeed, who should give more attention to the polish of language, than had been suitable either to the earlier period, or to the severer genius, of Dante. Writing almost in the commencement of his language, to which indeed he first gave a form qualifying it for the purposes of composition, the original bard was necessitated to employ many modes of expression, which the taste of his successor found reason for rejecting; and, filled with strong and bold conceptions, which he was eager to communicate, he sought for a compression of diction, which might forcibly, because briefly, convey them to his readers, not for the more diffuse elegance of phrase, which might better ornament the amatory lays of his successor. The style of Dante was appropriate to his subject; and, though it must have served to give energy to the newly-formed language, must have been too grave, and too sententious, to supply a standard for that of the general poetry of Italy. This was better furnished by Petrarch, whose poetry however might have given a character of too much feebleness, if the very different style [22] of the Divine Comedy had not previously infused into the language much of the power of its author. How much better indeed the later was accomodated to general imitation, than

[22] Picus of Mirandula observed of these two poets, 'that respectable critics of that, or the preceding age, remark in Petrarch a defect in matter and thought, in Dante an imperfection of language. The former, frequently introducing into his poems sentiments of common and trivial origin, possessed nevertheless the art of adorning them with all the glow and colouring of words. Dante, engaged on subjects of the sublimest and most dignified kind, and which naturally led to the introduction of the noblest thoughts uttered by St. Augustin, Aquinas, and other similar authors, in whose writings he was deeply conversant, is yet frequently harsh and dissonant in his language, and betrays much of the rusticity of a less polished age.'—Greswell's Mem. of Angelus Politianus, &c., p. 184. Manchester, 1805.

the earlier poet, appears plainly from the result. Petrarch has been followed by a crowd of lyric poets, while Dante has had no imitator.

The literary importance of the character of Petrarch must however by no means be conceived to be limited to the fame which he acquired by his Italian poetry, though on this part of his writings[23] the reputation, which he has obtained as a poet with succeeding ages, has been wholly established. Among the foremost[24] in urging the study of the Greek language, and the first[25] who engaged in a search for the forgotten classics with the ardour of passion, he was at once a philosopher, historian, orator, poet, and critic. He not only cultivated every kind of learning, but was active in procuring for it the protection of the princes of his age, and exciting by a very extended correspondence a general love of letters throughout France and Italy. Nor was he in this respect a mere scholar, implicitly receiving all the opinions consecrated by authority, but he was especially zealous in combating the errors of the misguided philosophy of his age, alchemy, astrology, and an excessive veneration for Aristotle. Possessing these other claims on the attention of mankind, he must, even if he had never been a poet, have been respected as one of the most distinguished men of his country, and particularly as the great restorer of Italian learning.

[23] This was a very small portion of his works, those composed in the Latin language filling twelve hundred pages, while about eighty comprehended all which he wrote in the Italian.—Ginguené, tome ii. p. 444. [24] In the year 1342 he began to learn the Greek language at Avignon, availing himself of the arrival of a Calabrian named Barlaam, who had passed the greater part of his life in Greece, and had been deputed to the pope, professedly to negotiate a union of the Greek and Latin churches, but really to solicit succours against the Turks. The dialogues of Plato were the principal subject of the lessons of this teacher, and the Italian poet was delighted with the refinements of the philosopher in regard to the union of souls, and the passion of love. We find him however in the year 1354 lamenting that he could not comprehend the poetry of Homer without assistance.—Mém. pour la Vie de Pétrarque, tome iii. pp. 346, 347. [25] Ginguené, tome ii. p. 435. One classical work he possessed, which has been lost to later ages, the treatise on glory by Cicero, lent by Petrarch to an old grammarian, and never recovered.—Ibid., p. 437. His success in extending the spirit of research was facilitated by his incessant travelling, itself perhaps a result of the inquietude caused by his passion for Laura.—Ibid., p. 370.

The passion which Petrarch cherished during twenty years for Laura, is a remarkable example of the influence of personal and contingent causes on the changes of society. That a poet should have conceived an amorous passion, and should have exercised his genius in endeavouring to win the affections of the object of his admiration, are not extraordinary events; but these would not of themselves have formed the peculiar poetry of Petrarch. For this it was required that the object of passion should be, not indeed insensible to admiration, but incapable of yielding to the seduction of irregular desire, and yet be placed beyond the reach of legitimate addresses. If Laura had been indifferent to the tenderness of her lover, his passion must have expired from want of encouragement; if she could have ceased to be virtuous, his poetry must have resembled the sensual strains of the ancient bards of Greece and Italy; if she had been unmarried, and attainable by an honourable union, the completion of his wishes must have terminated those anxieties and agitations, which formed the subject and the character of his verse. Laura was none of these, and therefore Petrarch continued to pour forth the complaints of his love, tender and passionate, but so purified from the grossness of an ordinary affection, that even in his life-time[26] it was considered by some persons as purely spiritual, and by others as only an allegorical representation of his devoted attachment to wisdom. The love of Petrarch, however, though refined to the utmost purity of sexual passion, was still a real affection for a living object[27], and was in this respect distinguished from the tender recollection of Dante, which had acquired from the death of its object the solemnity of a religious sentiment. The Italian poetry of Petrarch indeed owes its very existence, and not merely its peculiar character, to his love of Laura, for while he hoped for fame from his Latin compositions[28], he adopted in his amatory

[26] Storia della Poesia Ital., tomo ii. pp. 76, 77. [27] This he has distinctly stated in his Dialogues with Augustin.—Mém. pour la Vie de Pétrarque, tome ii. p. 119. The doubt appears to have been occasioned by a misconception of some Italians, in regard to some pleasantries of his friend the bishop of Lombes, who had told him that his Laura was but a phantom of his imagination, created to furnish a subject for his muse, and to procure reputation for himself.—Ibid., p. 285.

[28] Of his Italian compositions he says himself that, if he could have foreseen their success, he would have augmented their number and

verses the modern language of his country, as being intelligible to that living world, in which he wished the praises of his Laura to be known. He was accordingly surprised at the reputation which his Italian poetry had acquired for him; and he would be yet more astonished if he could now be apprised that, while his Latin poetry is read only by the inquisitive antiquary, he has been for those compositions, of which he always spoke as of the follies of his youth, respected by posterity as almost the creator of the lyric poetry of modern ages [29].

The circumstances of Petrarch's coronation illustrate the importance of the southern sovereignty of Italy to the encouragement of learning. When he had on the same day received from the senate of Rome, and from the university of Paris, offers of that honour, for which he had long and earnestly panted, he resolved that, in accepting the former of these offers, he would be indebted for the laurel crown to the judgment only of Robert, king of Naples. To the judgment of this prince he accordingly submitted his pretensions, and, when he had during three days undergone an examination in all the subjects of literature, history, and philosophy, in all which he was admitted to be qualified for receiving the proposed distinction, he proceeded to Rome, and was crowned in the capital. These laureate distinctions however seem to have been subject to a fatal influence even from their origin. Petrarch was esteemed by the royal critic for his Latin poem of Africa, which since has been neglected and forgotten; and posterity have crowned him with their applause for his Italian compositions, which appear to have been on that occasion wholly disregarded.

As the exile and vagrancy of Dante had inflamed the satiric spirit of his genius, so probably did the voluntary re-

have bestowed more labour on their style; but that, since the death of her, who was their subject, he was no longer able to supply their deficiencies.—Ginguené, tome ii. p. 560.

[29] The invention of the *canzoni*, or modern odes, belongs to the *troubadours*; and this species of composition had also been practised by other Italians before Petrarch; but he rendered them more perfect, and combined in his own productions the various qualities of poetry, which had separately distinguished those of preceding writers, uniting with the gravity of Dante the refinement of Guido Cavalcanti and the dignity of Cino da Pistoia.—Ibid., p. 561.

moval of Petrarch from Italy to Avignon prove favourable to the amorous effusions of his very different muse. The greater part of his life he passed near that region of France, in which the Provençal poetry, the language of love, had long been cultivated; and, however unworthy the *troubadours* may be deemed of being considered as his instructors, yet he appears to have been by this circumstance disposed to give more attention to their productions, and to improve their rude and imperfect essays into the construction of the lyric poetry of Italy[30].

The last of the distinguished triumvirate of Italian literature was Boccacio, who was born in the year 1313, nine years after that which had given Petrarch to the world. Like his two eminent predecessors, he originally proposed the pure writers of antiquity as the models of his imitation: and it was a view of the tomb of Virgil, which first kindled his poetic ardour[31]. But, though his studies were as classical, and as comprehensive, as those of his friend Petrarch, and his works in verse equally as in prose, in the Latin equally as in the Italian language, are very numerous, his fame is founded on a collection of novels named the *Decamerone;* and it is as the father of the prose composition of the modern language of his country, that he is here entitled to consideration. His poetical pursuits indeed he himself abandoned, when he saw the productions of Petrarch, despairing of contesting with this writer the claim of pre-eminence[32]. It has accordingly been observed by Tiraboschi, that Italian prose is as much indebted to Boccacio, as Italian poetry to Petrarch[33]; and the Italians still consider the *Decamerone* as the best prose composition in their language, its author having thus at once carried this species of composition to its perfection[34].

A curious scale may be remarked in the amorous affections of the triumvirate, who have been the authors of the refinement of the modern language of Italy, ending in its lowest graduation, as might be expected, with the author of its prose. All were powerfully influenced by the passion of love, but each in circumstances distinct and peculiar. The

[30] Mém. pour la Vie de Pétrarque, tome i. p. 154. [31] Storia della Poesia Ital., tomo ii. [32] Ibid., p. 159. [33] Ibid., p. 160. [34] Mém. pour la Vie de Pétrarque, tome iii. p. 609.

vehement and gloomy mind of Dante was elevated to a religious solemnity by the early death of one, whom he had loved from the simple purity of a childish attachment; the impassioned tenderness of Petrarch was refined into an almost platonic affection by a protracted admiration of a living, but unattainable object; Boccacio, the offspring of an irregular amour, appears to have been engaged only in licentious attachments, which have communicated to his tales a character of impurity, offensive even to his own more serious feelings in his later years. The Divine Comedy attracted the attention of the public by the united influence of political sarcasm, of grand conception, and of pathetic sentiment, and the lyric poetry of Petrarch could engage the general admiration by addressing itself to all the refined and elegant affections, which the music of verse was capable of exciting; but the prose of Boccacio could procure readers, or hearers, only by presenting amusement to the light and unthinking, and in that coarse and unpolished age such persons could be amused only by a licentiousness, which society could not at present tolerate[35].

Italian poetry, which in the fourteenth century had been ennobled by the genius of Dante and Petrarch, was in the fifteenth so neglected, that it almost degenerated into its original rudeness. The cause assigned for this strange reverse of fortune by the historian of Italian literature[36], indicates the peculiar suitableness of the time, in which the poetry of Provence exercised its influence for the improvement of the modern dialects of Europe. The intercourse established between Greece and Italy in the latter years of the fourteenth, and in the beginning of the fifteenth century, excited, says he, among the Italians such an enthusiasm for the learning of Greece, that all, who then aspired to the fame of letters, devoted themselves to this study[37], and Ita-

[35] These tales, licentious as they are, he says that he had composed in consequence of a command, which he was unable to resist.—Ginguené, tome iii. p. 82. [36] Storia della Poesia Ital., tomo ii. p. 198.

[37] Angelus Politianus, born in Tuscany in the year 1454, has the credit of being the first among the moderns, not of Greek extraction, who professed the Greek language: and his writings entitled him to the praise of the earliest and most successful restorer of Latin poetry, after the age of Petrarch and Dante.—Greswell's Mem. of Politianus,

lian poetry was cultivated by few, and with little success. If then the writers of Italy had not been encouraged and assisted by the Provençals, to make some efforts for the improvement of their native language, in the period preceding that, in which the restoration of the ancient classics attracted and engrossed the attention of the learned, the rude dialect of modern Italy would have been despised and neglected as a vulgar jargon, and the efforts of genius would have been exclusively employed in the study of the languages of distant ages. But as events actually occurred, every thing favoured the improvement of the modern poetry of Italy, even that very attachment to the study of the ancient classics by which it might otherwise have been overpowered and suppressed. Before the opportunity of full gratification had rendered the passion for ancient literature irresistible and overbearing, the example of the *troubadours* had induced the Italians to try, whether their own language, imperfect and barbarous as it was, might not be rendered an instrument of refined communication; and a few writers of superior endowments had actually proved to their countrymen, that it possessed powers of expression, which only their genius could have discovered amidst so much coarseness. When the capacity of the language had been thus essayed, and the success of distinguished writers had proved, that reputation might be acquired in this new species of composition, the general prevalence of the study of the ancient classics could but for a time withdraw the attention of scholars from the modern literature, and must have amply compensated for the interruption by correcting and informing the taste of the public. The revived study of Italian literature might then attain to its full maturity, aided, instead of being suppressed and destroyed, by that of ancient

&c., pp. 30—37. Pietro Bembo, born at Venice in the year 1470, distinguished himself by correcting the perverted taste in Latin composition, which then prevailed, persuading his countrymen to imitate Cicero, Virgil, and Cæsar, rather than Apuleius, Macrobius, and Statius.—Ibid., p. 439. At the revival of ancient literature such was the enthusiasm of scholars, that they adopted in their academical associations the practice of assuming classical appellations, for which they are said to have pleaded the example of some of the monastics, who renounced their own names for those of saints; nor was this practice discontinued before the year 1534, when the academicians began to assume modern distinctions.—Ibid., p. 128

learning. Tiraboschi has accordingly remarked[38], that the Italian writers of the fifteenth century just preserved their literature alive to the succeeding age, when it was not only restored to its former state, but advanced even to a higher degree of improvement.

The most illustrious patron of ancient learning in the fifteenth century, the celebrated Lorenzo de' Medici, was however also a composer of Italian poetry, and contributed much by his own efforts to recover it from the barbarism, into which it had degenerated since the days of Petrarch. It is likewise deserving of notice[39], that in the latter part of this century was introduced by Serafino of Aquila the practice of pronouncing extemporaneous verses on a proposed subject, which is peculiar to the Italians. It may be further remarked, that the fifteenth century was among this people distinguished by the number and eminence of its female scholars[40]. From the very birth of Italian poetry the ladies had begun to emulate the other sex in the attention, which they bestowed upon it; but the fifteenth century was perhaps more fruitful of female learning than all the preceding. Of this new class of scholars Mr. Roscoe[41] has remarked that, if they did not greatly contribute towards the progress of letters, they at least rendered the study of languages more general, and removed the idea, that the acquisition was attended with any extraordinary difficulty. He might have added, that they brought the refinement of literary intercourse from the halls of colleges to the societies of the world.

Not only the Provençal poetry, but also that of Italy, was employed almost exclusively on amorous subjects; and such poetry, being addressed to that sex, whose influence it celebrated, would naturally dispose them to try, whether nature had endowed them with the qualities necessary for literary distinction. The studies of females, thus begun with the poetry, of which they were themselves the objects, did not continue to be limited to modern languages, but comprehended also those of ancient Greece and Rome, as in the fifteenth century they attracted general attention. The women of Italy[42], where the classic languages were first re-

[38] Storia della Poesia Ital., tomo ii. p. 199. [39] Ibid., pp. 218, 219.
[40] Ibid., p. 239. [41] Life of Lorenzo, vol. ii. p. 95. [42] Meiner's Hist. of Women, vol. ii. p. 141. Lond., 1808.

vived, led the way in this new path of ambition; those of France speedily followed the example of the females of the neighbouring peninsula; and the French ladies, who distinguished themselves by various accomplishments of learning, became the general models of their sex throughout the other countries of Europe.

During these two centuries, which thus formed the modern poetry of Italy, that of France, on the contrary, experienced an almost total interruption, the Romance of the Rose[43], begun by William of Lorris, who died about the year 1260, and completed by John of Meun, who seems to have flourished about the year 1310, being superior to every other production of French poetry down to the reign of Francis I. The prosaic genius of the language and of the people appears to have then begun to be felt, and the time had not yet arrived, in which the French began to be poets by imitation. The poetry of the southern provinces, never excellent, had been the creature of local and temporary circumstances, and had perished with them. The functions of France in the general system of policy consisted, first in originating the whole frame of European society, and afterwards in presiding over the federative combinations, which had been slowly and gradually developed; and for these purposes a people appears to have been required possessing a social, rather than an imaginative character, delighting in the familiarities of living intercourse, and estranged from the ideal contemplations of a poetic fancy.

The language and the poetry of Spain[44] were perhaps earlier in their formation than those of Italy, but so much

[43] Warton's Hist. of English Poetry, vol. i. p. 368. Lond. 1774—1778. Even this poem was admired for the ingenuity of its allegorical representations, not for its poetical excellencies. The language is not at all figurative, the descriptions excite no interest, and the metre is the only characteristic of poetry.—Sismondi, De la Litt. du Midi de l'Europe, tome i. pp. 305, 306.

[44] The romance of the *Cid*, the hero of the Spaniards, was more ancient than the poem of Dante by one hundred and fifty years. It is believed to have been composed about the middle of the twelfth century, and about fifty years after the death of the great chief, who was its subject. It is described as extremely barbarous both in the language, and in the versification. The title has been formed from *sayd*, or *lord*, the title given to the Spaniard by five Moorish chiefs, whom he had vanquished.—Ibid., tome iii. pp. 115, 116, 149, 150.

slower in their development, that before the sixteenth century no display of excellence attracts the notice of the historian[45]. If the language was polished, if the versification had acquired a little more flexibility, if composition had been nourished by a little more of foreign knowledge, these advantages were more than compensated by the introduction of pedantry and affectation. The reign of the emperor Charles V. must be regarded as the period[46], which at once excited the genius of the Spaniards by the animating consciousness of national importance, and corrected their taste by engaging them in a frequent intercourse with strangers. The prose indeed of Castile[47] may be considered as having had its commencement about the same time with that of Italy, a collection of novels, intitled the Count Lucanor, having been published there about the same time with the *Decamerone* of Boccacio. The Spanish is however very different from the Tuscan collection, being composed of grave lessons of policy and morals, given to a serious people in the form of apologues.

In Portugal poetry[48] appears to have in some sort commenced even with the monarchy, in the middle of the twelfth century, and the commerce of Lisbon seems to have introduced into it a knowledge of the great Italian poets of the fourteenth, long before they became known in the rest of the peninsula. The whole period however of the literary history of this country, which preceded the commencement of the fifteenth century, belongs rather to its language, than to its poetry, as its remains serve to illustrate little more than the formation of the Portuguese diction. The fifteenth century, which expanded all the energies of the national character, was naturally the period of the rise of the literature of Portugal; and the splendid reign of Emmanuel, which began only five years before its close, produced the first of the Portuguese poets, Bernardin Ribeyro, who has attained to a high reputation. The most distinguished of the works of Ribeyro were eclogues, probably written in imitation of the Italian Sannazario; but the imitation seems to have been peculiarly agreeable to the taste of his countrymen, for pastoral composition became the prevailing poetry

[45] De la Litt. du Midi, tome iii. p. 252. [46] Ibid., p. 267.
[47] Ibid., p. 209. [48] Ibid., tome iv. pp. 267, &c.

of Portugal. A romance in prose, written by Ribeyro, the title of which is *Menina e Moça*, or the Innocent Young Girl, is the first composition of that country, or indeed of the peninsula, in which an attempt has been made to elevate the language of prose to the expression of passion. Spain[49] however, amidst some tasteless chroniclers, had also some biographers, who have been noticed with respect.

In the same century with the works of Dante and Petrarch, though many years later, arose the poetry of England, Geoffrey Chaucer, the first English versifier, according to Johnson[50], who wrote poetically, and almost the first who wrote the English language[51], as distinguished from the

[49] De la Litt. du Midi, tome iii. p. 252. [50] Preface to his Dictionary. The reputation of Chaucer, as an improver of our versification, rests principally on the invention, or at least on the first adoption, of the heroic verse of ten syllables. All his immediate successors speak with rapture of the elegance and splendour of his diction. The characteristics of our poetry during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries are an exuberance of ornament, and an affectation of latinity, neither of which is found in any of the poets anterior to Chaucer. This therefore may be supposed to be what Chaucer himself and his successors called an *ornate style*. No poet is however in general more free from pedantry. But the attentive reader will find that in the use of words of Latin derivation, most of which are common to the French and Italian languages, he very generally prefers the inflexions of the latter, either as thinking them more sonorous, or because they are nearer to the original; and that in his descriptive poetry he is very fond of multiplying his epithets, and of copying all the other peculiarities of the Italian poetry, from which his favourite metre is unquestionably derived. Spenser has even described his compositions, as 'the well of English undefiled.'—Ellis's Specimens of the Early English Poets, vol. i. pp. 209, &c. Lond., 1803. This appellation however may more properly, with the author of the English Dictionary, be given to the writings of the age of Elizabeth, at which time the foreign infusions had ceased to produce disturbance, and one pure stream of speech had at length been formed. [51] Robert of Gloucester, who is referred to the thirteenth century, seemed to Johnson to have used a kind of intermediate language, neither Saxon or English. Mr. Ellis, who refers the commencement of the English language to the year 1216, considers Robert of Gloucester as decidedly English.—Ibid., pp. 76, 97. The first according to Johnson, who can be properly said to have written English, was Sir John Gower, who calls Chaucer his disciple, though he survived him two years. He was principally distinguished by his *Confessio Amantis*, containing nearly thirty-five thousand lines, and written at the desire of Richard II. between the years 1377 and 1393. —Turner's Hist. of England, vol. ii. pp. 482—495.

Saxon dialect, having been born according to the general opinion, in the year 1328, or, as Mr. Turner[52] has argued, about the year 1340.

When Chaucer began to compose his poems, he found a language adequate indeed to the purposes of ordinary communication, but destitute of the power of expressing poetical conceptions; and he was compelled to seek additional resources[53] in the languages of France and Italy, that he might be enabled to polish the asperity of his own, and to enrich it with softer cadences and a more copious and varied phraseology. The modification, which the Anglo-Saxon language had already received from the Norman conquest of England, fitted it for receiving further improvement from the writers of France. Chaucer accordingly translated, probably as his first essay in poetry, between seven and eight thousand lines of the Romance of the Rose. The English poet however, who had visited Italy[54], and was personally acquainted with Petrarch, and probably with Boccacio, imitated also the writers of that country[55]. He has in particular not only borrowed from the celebrated prose work of Boccacio the design of his Canterbury Tales[56], but he has also composed his poem, intitled the Knight's Tale, in imitation of the Theseid of the same writer, a poem preserved by its author from the flames, when, in his admiration of the superior poetry of Petrarch, he condemned the rest to destruction. Though however Chaucer was an imitator, he imitated with the originality of a master. The poetic beauties, which he borrowed, he has improved; and in his collection of tales he has not only invented a more natural, and a more convenient occasion, for their supposed recital, than that which had been employed by Boccacio, but he has also contrived to render all his characters completely British, presenting no indication of a foreign origin.

As the poetry of Chaucer has now passed generally into

[52] Turner's Hist. of England, vol. ii. p. 500. [53] Warton's Hist. of English Poetry, vol. i. p. 342. [54] Ibid. [55] In his Canterbury Tales he calls Dante 'the wise poet of Florence,' and frequently mentions him. Petrarch he describes as

. . . the laureat poete
. . . . whose rhetorike swete
Enlumined all Italie of poetrie.

[56] Warton, vol. i. p. 342.

oblivion, though detached passages may still be read with other gratification than that of mere curiosity, he cannot be placed in comparison with the great masters of Italian poetry, who at once established themselves in the first line of composition, and fixed the language of their country. But the English language was in his time far less formed, than that of Italy was in the time of Dante, who had in this respect little more to do, than to choose among the numerous dialects of his country, and could even then foresee that, for the purposes of composition, the *vulgar eloquence* would soon gain ascendency over the more learned dialect, which was still cherished in the intercourse of scholars. The language of England, which in the time of Chaucer was but struggling into being from the union of the Saxon and Norman dialects, appears to have had another function, than that of poetical composition. Capable of expressing with energy the most sublime conceptions, but not easily supplying the flowing numbers of poetry, it might indeed become by its intrinsic vigour the language of the Muses, but seems to have been naturally more fitted to communicate with precision and force the principles of a profound philosophy, and thus to dispose writers rather to exercise themselves in the disquisitions of reasoning, than to indulge themselves in the play of imagination. The three languages indeed, which have been chiefly considered, appear to have had three distinct and appropriate functions in the general system. The language of Italy, abounding in the softest combinations of sound, seems to have been particularly qualified for poetical composition; that of France, prosaic in its structure, but expressive and epigrammatic, may be considered as the dialect of the intercourses of life; and that of England, energetic and copious, but little modified by principles of harmony, and little subtilised by the habits of personal communication, may be regarded as specially applicable to the graver investigations of the social order.

The early poetry of England, as in Italy and France, experienced a long interruption, though from a peculiar cause. It was not suppressed, as in Italy, by the prevalent study of the ancient classics, nor, as in France, by the character of the language and of the people; but it was overwhelmed and lost amidst the agitations of civil contention. In the

struggles of the rival families of York and Lancaster for the possession of the crown, the charms of poetry were neglected and forgotten, and its English history from Chaucer to Spenser, or through nearly three centuries, is almost a blank. Lydgate indeed, who cannot have been born later than the year 1375, deserves to be noticed, not for his verbose and languid poetry, but because[57], he added much to the copiousness of our language, and is the first of those, whose writings possess perspicuity of phrase to a merely modern reader.

The succession of poetry, suspended in England, was however maintained by a series of distinguished writers in the neighbouring kingdom of Scotland. In this series we find Dunbar[58], a writer of the latter part of the fifteenth and the earlier part of the sixteenth century, who was according to Mr. Ellis the greatest poet produced by Scotland, when he published his treatise. The language of Scotland was not in this period considerably different from that of England, though it afterwards deviated into a separate dialect, as the usages of the living speech were successively adopted by the writers of that country[59]. The two languages[60] seem to have attained their greatest similarity about the middle of the fourteenth century, or in the very age of Chaucer.

While a beginning was thus given to the poetry of England, Wicliffe published the first English translation of the sacred scriptures, and thus, by an important work, which attracted very general attention, gave a character to its prose. Remarkably different in this respect has been the fortune of

[57] Warton, vol. ii. p. 52. [58] He was born about the year 1465. His most admired works are the Thistle and the Rose, and the Golden Terge. The former of these was composed for the marriage of James IV. of Scotland, with Margaret eldest daughter of Henry VII. of England; the latter is a moral allegory, the object of which is to shew the gradual and imperceptible influence of love, which even the golden target of reason cannot always repel.—Ellis, vol. i. pp. 377, 385—387. [59] In accounting for this similarity Sir W. Scott admits, in a limited degree, the opinion, which supposes the Saxon language to have been imposed upon the Scots by successful invasions; but he conceives the grand source to have been the language of the Picts, referred by him to a Belgic origin. The Norman, he thinks, was probably introduced by the influx of Norman nobles, either driven into exile, or urged by a chivalrous spirit to visit the court of Scotland. Review of Ellis's Spec. in Misc. Prose Works, vol. xvii., pp. 9, 10. [60] Ellis, vol. i. p. 396.

England from those of Italy and France. Among the Italians prose composition was rendered popular by a collection of tales, in which genius was employed to embellish licentiousness; nor perhaps, where the gratification of poetry was so easily supplied, would any other means have been sufficiently attractive. In France the prosaic character of the language presented a strong discouragement to poetical composition, and the nation seems to have spontaneously applied itself to that species of literature, in which alone it appears to have been enabled to excel. In England, where the elements of poetical composition existed, but not very easily susceptible of an agreeable form, a translation of the sacred scriptures at once furnished a standard of the language of prose[61], and deeply imprinted in the minds of the people a knowledge of the most important truths. The English reformer was born in the year 1324, and in the year 1380 published his translation.

The improvement of literature gave occasion to a revolution in the philosophy of Europe, which, by weakening the authority of Aristotle, prepared the mind for the future exercise of its powers of enquiry. At the close of the thirteenth century the tenets of that philosopher had been so intimately combined with the doctrines of Christianity in the scholastic philosophy, that his authority was classed by Christian teachers even with that of the Evangelists themselves. This incongruous mixture of pagan philosophy and revealed truth, which had been useful in training the reviving genius of Europe to acute disputation, had been at length so systematised by successive reasoners, that it shackled the powers of the human mind, and a new school of philosophy became necessary for vindicating the liberty of human reason. Europe was not then prepared for the independent exertion of the faculties of men, and the monarch of the schools could be deposed only by setting up a rival.

The two great leaders of the ancient philosophy were Plato and Aristotle, characterised respectively by qualities by which they were not only distinguished, but even contrasted. The

[61] Mr. Turner has remarked that, with a small degree of attention, we may still read and understand the New Testament of Wicliffe, nearly as well as the translation, which is now used.—Hist. of England, vol. ii. p. 560.

former, lofty in speculation, and eloquent in diction, but not very precise in reasoning, captivated those who delighted in the contemplation of grand and elevated objects, though very often imperfectly presented to their comprehension. The latter, acute, perspicuous, and practical, gratified all those who were desirous of exercising and improving their intellectual powers, especially as his philosophy, not limited, like that of Plato, to the more sublime subjects of meditation, embraced the whole circle of the knowledge of the ancient world. These men naturally divided the mental empire of the world, the speculative attaching themselves to the eloquent mysticism of Plato, the argumentative ranging themselves under the subtilty of Aristotle. The lively fancy of the Greeks accordingly preserved in the eastern empire a predilection for the former, while the latter was long regarded with exclusive veneration by the more sober reasoners of the west.

The introduction of Platonism into western Europe was therefore a consequence of that of Grecian literature. Barlaam, the Calabrian monk, who instructed Petrarch in the Greek language, read with him the writings at once of Homer and of Plato, for the latter of whom the poet conceived an enthusiastic veneration, which strongly influenced the character of his own compositions. His example and authority attracted to the Platonic philosophy the attention of the most enlightened persons in Italy, especially of the Medici, from whom it received the most effectual protection. Its formal revival was begun by Cosmo de' Medici about the middle of the fifteenth century[62], in the institution of the Florentine academy, the sole purpose of which was the study of the doctrine of Plato. Cosmo had been incited to form this establishment by his conversations with Gemisthius Pletho, a Greek philosopher, who was one of the persons delegated by the Greek government to the council assembled first at Ferrara, and afterwards at Florence, on the proposal of uniting the Greek and Latin churches. Lorenzo, the grandson of Cosmo, was carefully educated in the same system, and a poetical abstract of the doctrines of Plato attests the proficiency which he had made in this study. With the design of attracting more attention to his favourite philosophy, he

[62] Roscoe's Life of Lorenzo, vol. i. pp. 35, 160, &c.

renewed the solemn annual feasts to the memory of the philosopher, which had been celebrated from the time of his death to that of the deaths of his disciples, Photinus and Porphyrius, but had then been discontinued during twelve centuries. By this institution, which subsisted several years, the philosophy of Plato was maintained in the highest estimation. It can indeed scarcely be believed in the present age, that the enthusiasm of a speculative system of philosophy could have led any one to prefer a pagan religion to Christianity, and yet George Gemisthius Pletho[63] declared his persuasion, that paganism would soon gain an ascendency over the religions both of Christ and of Mohammed.

It is a curious fact, that a very distinguished person at this very time supported by powerful protection the cause of Aristotle, as if to maintain a temporary balance of the two systems. Nicholas V., the pontiff most distinguished by his love of learning, was advanced to the papacy in the year 1447, but a few years before Constantinople fell under the dominion of the Turks, and was a strenuous patron[64] of those Greeks, who favoured the doctrine of that philosopher.

The servile admiration, with which the tenets of Aristotle had long been reverenced, could not be more speedily dissipated, than by the establishment of a rival pretension; nor could the human mind have been more effectually prepared for the independent exertion of its powers, than by being exercised in the discussion of the comparative merits of the two ancient philosophers. With this discussion accordingly the history of the modern philosophy[65] has been considered as having commenced. Nor was the emancipation of the human mind obstructed by the new doctrine, for the philosophy of Plato did not long maintain its credit. The extravagancies[66] of some of the new principles of his school soon disparaged the doctrine of their master. Ficino himself, who had been educated by the direction of Cosmo, for the special purpose of supporting his projected academy, and was under Lorenzo the great champion of the new school of Platonism, has exhibited remarkable instances of philosophi-

[63] Hist. de la Philosophie Moderne par Buhle, tome ii. pp. 140, 141. [64] Ibid., pp. 44, 45. [65] Ibid., p. 108. [66] Roscoe's Life of Lorenzo, vol. i. pp. 168, 169.

cal absurdity. The mystical and fanciful philosophy of Plato was indeed naturally less fitted than the contentious dogmas of Aristotle, to seize the human mind with a firm and lasting grasp; and therefore, though it served to weaken the dominion of the other doctrine, it was not strong enough to impose its own authority.

The preparatory processes of the modern philosophy were complete, when the restoration of Platonism had disposed the human mind to assert its powers. Many years however elapsed, before an effort was made to establish new principles of philosophy, this having been first done in the latter part of the sixteenth century by Jordano Bruno[67]; nor was it made with success until Bacon, in the year 1620, gave to the world his *Novum Organum*[68], or new instrument of philosophy, which even at the close of two centuries, amidst all their various acquisitions, is still quoted with respect, as containing principles, which these have only served to illustrate and confirm.

CHAPTER XIV.

Of several independent occurrences and usages of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

In the histories of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries various occurrences and usages may be distinguished, which, as they operated generally upon society, may be most con-

[67] Jordano Bruno, born at Nola, in the territory of Naples, was a Dominican monk. In the year 1585, he attacked the Aristotelic doctrine publicly at Paris with a great number of philosophical theses; and in the year 1598, he was burned at Rome by the Inquisition as a heretic and apostate, and for having violated his vows. He does not indeed appear to have embraced the religion of Protestants; but he entertained doubts in regard to transubstantiation and the immaculate conception, as also in respect to many other articles of religious belief, and he inveighed with severity against the ignorance and vices of the monks.—Buhle, tome ii. pp. 604—609. [68] This new instrument was induction from experiments, which Bacon compared to the mariner's compass, all former discoveries in the arts and sciences resembling only those, which navigators could accomplish by coasting the shores of the ancient continent, or crossing some small and inland seas.

veniently contemplated in a collective view, however dissimilar and unconnected. These are the invention and use of gunpowder and the modern artillery, the great plague of the fourteenth century, the appearance of the Gypsies in Europe, the practice of card-playing, the introduction of the venereal disease, the restoration of the fine arts, and the invention of printing. Of these the first, second, and third, may be referred to the political, the last and that immediately preceding to the intellectual, the others to the moral condition of Europe.

The invention of gunpowder, and the consequent introduction of the modern artillery, must necessarily have affected the political situation of Europe in many important particulars. The existence of the feudal independence of the nobility required, that their castles should be strongholds capable of resisting the assaults of the sovereign. An invention therefore, which rendered fortified places in general less tenable, and the fortifications actually existing entirely useless, must have given a decisive impulse to the declining power of the nobles, and is entitled to be considered as having exercised a principal influence in transforming the governments of Europe from their feudal character into more orderly combinations of political society. The same invention has been already noticed[1], as it destroyed the importance of armed knights, and consequently put a period to the system and usages of chivalry, each armed knight being in truth a moving fortification, on which the weapons then employed could make little or no impression, but incapable of withstanding the ravages of the new warfare. The nobles accordingly and the knights gave way together before the power of artillery; and, while the former were reduced to acknowledge the control of the sovereign, the latter were brought under the control of more reasonable and peaceable usages. There is yet another view, in which the political influence of this invention deserves consideration. When the art of war began to require a great and expensive apparatus, which could be provided and maintained only by considerable funds, the military exertions of a nation demanded operations of finance, which variously affected the political relations of society. The sovereign,

[1] Book i. chapter xix.

enjoying the management of larger funds, was proportionally exalted in importance and power over the other orders of the state; commercial industry, by which alone these increased funds could be supplied, became an object of great attention in the plans of every government; and the circulation of these funds, as they were applied in providing for the exigencies of the government, rendered the mutual connexion of the members of each society more intimate, and the union of the whole more perfect.

The advantages indeed of this great military revolution have been recently disputed[2]. It has been represented that, on the one hand, we must be appalled at the future prospects of the species, subjected as it is to the increasing powers of destruction, which science may bestow on the new instrument of death; and on the other, that it is a very doubtful problem, whether the general happiness of society has lost more through arbitrary power, or gained through the suppression of disorder. But it may fairly be questioned, whether the waste of human life has been really increased by the improvement of the means of destruction, for in every case an army may be expected to give way, when it shall have sustained, by whatsoever means, a certain proportion of loss. That the political problem should appear doubtful may have arisen from the predilection, with which an author regards a subject long contemplated with curiosity and attention. Imperfect indeed have been the later arrangements of the greater part of the states of Europe; but an impartial enquirer cannot fail to consider them as more directly conducive to the happiness and improvement of our species than the armed anarchy of the preceding ages. This had its own utility, as it served to furnish principles of independence to the incipient system of policy; but, when it had discharged this salutary function, it was not fitted for a longer continuance.

Though the composition of gunpowder[3] is said to have

[2] Hallam's Hist. of the Mid. Ages, vol. i. p. 361. [3] In the History of Tatary, annexed to the Bibliothèque Orientale of D'Herbelot, it is stated that the use of fire-arms was introduced into China under a dynasty, which ended in the year 907, and consequently at some time preceding that year. It is not indeed certain that these fire-arms were cannon, and not rather machines for throwing arrows charged with

been known to the Chinese in more ancient times, no trace of it has been discovered in Europe much anterior to the middle of the thirteenth century. The invention has been commonly ascribed to Roger Bacon; but he appears to have received his knowledge from the Arabs of Spain[4], for the use of it in engines of war, though rather it seems to produce a destructive explosion, than as it is employed in artillery, is mentioned by an Arabic writer in the Escurial collection, about the year 1249. For the use of this powder among the Christians of Europe we must look to the fourteenth century. Cannon are first said to be employed in this part of the world at the siege of Piegillaume[5], in the year 1338; and they are said to have been used two years afterwards by the Moors of Spain in battle, and at the siege of Tarifa, and after two years more at the siege of Algeciras. Edward III. of England, brought them into the field at the battle of Cressy, fought in the year 1346. The new mode of war was perfected, as might be supposed, by slow degrees, the artillery being at first rudely constructed and unskilfully managed; but so considerable was its progress in the sixteenth century, that Francis I. is reported to have had four thousand horses for his train of artillery[6]. Hand-cannon, or muskets of some description, appear to have been used in the year 1411, by a part of the army of the duke of Burgundy[7].

About the middle of the fourteenth century a violent plague raged in almost every country of Europe[8], and is re-

combustible substances; but, as it is certain that the Chinese had guns in the year 1259, the noise of which is compared to that of the former machines, it is concluded that these also must have been constructed on the same principle.—D'Herbelot, tome v. pp. 259, &c. In Dow's translation of Ferishta, vol. i. p. 53, an elephant is described as alarmed by the report of a gun in a battle fought in India in the year 1008.

[4] See chapter iv. of this book; also Hallam's State of Europe during the Middle Ages, vol. i. pp. 361, 362. [5] Ducange, voce *Bombarda*, quoted in Mém. pour la Vie de Pétrarque, tome iii. p. 313. [6] Henault, vol. i. p. 365. [7] Hallam, ubi supra. [8] An extraordinary succession of violent rains in the winter of the year 1345, and the spring of that which followed, caused a general and almost entire failure of the harvest of Europe; and a very severe famine, the consequence of this failure, so enfeebled multitudes of people, that they became more than usually susceptible of contagion. While Europe was thus visited by scarcity, the plague appeared in the country adjacent to the Don

ported to have carried away a large proportion of its population. It must be supposed that such a chasm, so suddenly made in the system, produced some important effect on its adjustment. A short interval would doubtless restore the population, for this will accommodate itself to the means of subsistence; but even the temporary reduction of it, occurring at a time when so many causes were operating on the social system of Europe, must in some important manner have affected its interior relations. This influence appears to have consisted in facilitating the transition from the feudal system to that other order of society, by which it has been succeeded. As it was an effect of that system to encourage an increase of population, the rude magnificence

and at Terbizond, from which places it spread in the year 1347 through Syria, Chaldea, Mesopotamia, Egypt, the islands of the Archipelago, Turkey, Greece, Armenia, and Russia. From the Levant it was soon communicated to Italy. In the year 1348 it penetrated into Savoy, France, and Catalonia; and in the following it extended itself to all the remaining countries of the west. In the year 1350, it spread its ravages towards the north; and the little and remote, but illustrious, republic of Iceland, was annihilated in the general desolation. Brabant alone escaped the contagion. It was calculated that throughout Europe three-fifths of the population were destroyed.—Hist. des Républ. Ital. tome vi. pp. 7—23. The distress of Florence either actually gave occasion to the *Decamerone* of Boccacio, or was selected for the supposed occasion by the fancy of the author. He represents seven young females and three young men, as agreeing to withdraw together for ten days from the scene of melancholy and danger into a rural retreat, and to seek amusement in the successive relation of agreeable narratives, each of these ten persons furnishing a share of the recreation of every day by telling a story. The idea of forming such a connexion for the hundred tales of the Decamerone, has been by Ginguené supposed to have been borrowed from the *Dolopathos*, or Romance of the King and the Seven Sages, an Indian story successively translated into the Arabian, the Hebrew, the Syriac, and the Greek language, and imitated in Latin from the Greek in the twelfth century, which imitation was in the same century translated into French both in verse and in prose, though with some variations. Three of the stories of the *Decamerone* are found among those of the *Dolopathos*, the title of the Latin imitation. The connexion of the tales is formed in the original romance by supposing a king to be urged by a mistress to put his son to death, and to be diverted from compliance during seven days by as many sages, each of whom tells stories during one day, but all, except the last, are defeated by the stories, which the mistress relates in her turn. We have here also the origin of the Thousand and One Nights and the Sultana Sheherazad.—Hist. Lit. d'Italie, tome iii. pp. 70—76.

and power of the nobles consisting in maintaining from the produce of their lands great numbers of dependents, it seems to have been unavoidable that much confusion should arise from its dissolution, if a great and sudden reduction of those numbers had not been by some cause effected. Causes, which have long and powerfully acted upon society, continue to operate long after those circumstances, in which they had acquired their efficiency, have ceased to exist, as the movement caused by the impulse of a mechanical force is maintained, though that force is no longer exerted. Great disorder might therefore have at length arisen in Europe, if the plethory of its organisation had not been removed by a sudden and severe infliction of pestilential disease. To the existing generation the calamity may have been not greater, or even less, than that which would have resulted from a population unsuited to the actual circumstances of society. That great confusion would otherwise have resulted from the great change of political circumstances, has been practically proved by the distress of the highlanders of Scotland[9], among whom the usages of the feudal ages have been cherished almost to the present time. The general state of European society experienced in the fourteenth century the same change, which has latterly spread into the recesses of the Scotish mountains; but, as maritime discovery had not then provided those retreats for an inconvenient population, which are now open in the imperfectly-peopled regions of the world, the only emigration, which the actual state of society permitted, was to the grave.

Within the same period of time also occurred the arrival, and the dispersion throughout Europe, of the people distinguished by the name of Gypsies. This may be thought a subject unworthy of a political speculator, and it certainly does not possess very great importance; a recent publication however[10] while it has thrown much light on the history of their tribes, has shewn that it merits some investigation. It is certain that they first appeared in the west of Europe in the earlier part of the fifteenth century. In Ger-

[9] Lord Selkirk's Observ. on the State of the Highlands of Scotland. Edinb., 1806. [10] Dissert. on the Gypsies by H. M. G. Grellman.

many they were first noticed in the year 1417, and from that country they seem to have passed successively, within a few years after that time, into Swisserland, Italy, France, and Spain. All which can be directly collected concerning the origin of their migration is, that they came immediately from Turkey into the western countries of Europe, and that they themselves alleged, that they had previously migrated into Turkey from Egypt, where also they had been strangers. From a consideration however of their language, appearance, and manners, the author of the dissertation, to which allusion has been made, has conjectured with considerable probability, that they had been originally Hindoos, of the despised caste denominated Parias or Suders; and from a comparison of dates he has further inferred, that their emigration from Hindostan was occasioned by the invasion of Tamerlane, who ravaged that country in the years 1408 and 1409. We have before seen that conqueror arresting the fall of the Greek empire by crushing the strength of Bajazet[11], and preparing the way for the successes of the Portuguese in India, by breaking the power of the Mohammedans in that country[12]. According to the very probable conjecture of this writer, we now view him driving from the east a numerous horde of cheats and thieves, to spread themselves among the nations of Europe.[13]

When the Gypsies, so denominated because supposed to be of Egyptian origin, arrived in Europe, they are said to have represented themselves as Egyptian pilgrims, who were constrained to wander during seven years, though of the occasion of this pilgrimage they gave not only unsatisfactory, but even contradictory accounts. It has been conjectured that they might themselves have merely stated, that they had come from Egypt, and that the connexion between that country and the history of the New Testament might have persuaded the Christians of that age, that only compulsion could have determined them to quit a country so interesting. But, whatever was the origin of the notion, whether they themselves invented it as a convenient passport, or adopted

[11] Chapter xi. of this book. [12] Chapter iv. of this book. [13] They did not however all migrate into Europe. Grellman tells us, sect. i. chap. ii. that they wander about in Asia, and that in the interior part of Africa they plunder the merchants of Agades.

the error of the Europeans, the consequence was, that their progress was not only not opposed, but even favoured and assisted. The inconveniences of such a visitation at length became sensible, and measures began to be adopted for removing them. Spain, where measures of severity had been already employed against the Moors, was naturally foremost in these proceedings. There accordingly the first edict for the banishment of Gypsies was issued in the year 1492, or seventy-four years after their first appearance in Europe. The example was imitated by most of the other states, Hungary and Transylvania having been the only countries, in which any efforts have been hitherto exerted, though with little success, to convert into useful subjects these troublesome invaders[14]. As however they enjoyed a constant toleration in Turkey, as the execution of the laws of the Christian nations was frequently relaxed, and the edicts of banishment were issued without concert and co-operation, these proscriptions had but little effect, and the Gypsies continued to be dispersed in considerable numbers, though in very unequal proportion, according to the greater or less vigilance exercised by the police.

The operation of this inroad of cheats and thieves appears to have consisted in directing the minds of men to the necessity of a more vigilant administration of interior government. The fifteenth century, in which so many causes were acting to change the structure of society in Europe, seems to have required this peculiar agency. The old jurisdictions of the feudal system having sunk into decay, the exaltation of the power of the sovereign, while it extended the energies of government through a wider sphere, appears to have demanded that some great and obvious grievance should at the same time solicit its attention to the concerns of the interior administration, especially as the commercial spirit of Europe was soon to be roused to much greater exertions, and consequently the security of property was to become an object of much increased importance.

[14] The plan was begun by the empress Maria Theresa. Several decrees relative to this object were published in Hungary from the year 1768. Little effect having been produced, these orders were repeated in the year 1773, though without any success. The emperor Joseph in the year 1782 issued similar orders for Transylvania, apparently ignorant of the failure in Hungary.—Grellman, chap. xv.

The three particulars hitherto considered have been referred to the political character of European society, as tending, in the first instance, to exalt the sovereign power on the ruins of the feudal aristocracy, to reduce the extravagancies of chivalry to the habits of more orderly society, and to favour the formation of the extended system of modern finance; in the second, to accommodate by a sudden and great reduction the population of Europe to the great change of circumstances, which under the united operation of various causes it was then experiencing; and in the last, to direct to the cares of internal administration that attention of government, which might else have been exercised on external objects, as better fitted to gratify ambition. Those which remain to be considered, are referred to the moral or the intellectual character of society, on which they all appear to have acted with a favourable influence.

The most remarkable characteristic of European intercourse in modern times is the freedom of the social communication of the two sexes. This freedom had been in a considerable degree guarded against abuse by the system of chivalry, which, however fantastical and extravagant, was yet a salutary corrective of European manners, softening the rude ferocity of the feudal warriors, and bestowing upon the other sex a romantic veneration. But when, in the changes of society, the artificial notions of this system began to lose their influence on the minds of men, and the idolatrous reverence of the female sex to subside into a reasonable communication of natural sentiment, it became necessary that some counteracting principles should be introduced, which might chasten the public habits, and hinder the freedom of modern intercourse from degenerating into an abandoned libertinism.

The practise of card-playing, however objectionable in an age of more advanced improvement, appears to have furnished one of these correctives[15], by fixing attention upon an object separated from all the feelings of passion, and thus infusing a portion of indifference into the intercourse of the two sexes, which allowed them to be familiar with less danger to the interests of virtue. Society is certainly in a preferable state, when it is independent of this resource, and capable of af-

[15] Lettre sur le Jeu des Cartes, par Pintoh. Lond. 1768.

fording gratification to a reasonable and virtuous mind by a communion of intellect and of sensibility; but this state of society is one of very advanced improvement, and in our progress towards it we must be contented with expedients, which abstracted reason may not approve, though practically auxiliary to its influence. The sober dulness of the card-table accordingly succeeded to the visionary folly of chivalry. The principle of a more refined intercourse of the sexes had been infused into society by the latter; the former seems to have then acted as a useful corrective, in the same manner as the mineral acids are supposed to neutralise the elements of contagion, and permit a safe communication even in the habitations of disease.

The practice of card-playing has been said to have been invented about the year 1390, for the amusement of Charles VI. of France, who was subject to melancholy. It however appears, that playing-cards had been known in France so early as in the year 1341[16], that they had been introduced in the year 1300, and that they had been commonly used in Italy at the close of the thirteenth century. It is the opinion of Mr. Singer, that they had been received severally from the Moors by the Italians, the Spaniards, and the French, as the game of chess was certainly derived from that people[17],

[16] Singer's Researches into the History of Playing-Cards. Lond. 1816. [17] There appears, says Mr. Singer, such striking analogies and strong resemblances between the games of chess and cards in their first simple forms, that the origination of the latter from the former may be deduced with a high degree of probability. In the early cards we have the king, knight, and knave, and the numerical cards or common soldiers. The oriental game of chess has also its king, visir, and horse-men, and its pawns or common soldiers. The parties at cards indeed are doubled, being four instead of two. But, he remarks, the Indian game of chess, as described by Mr. Christie, called *chaturanga*, or the four kings, represents four princes with their troops forming two allied armies on each side. In the Encyclopædia Britannica, art. *Cards*, it is stated that the four kings represent the Jewish, Greek, Roman, and Frankish monarchies, by the figures of David, Alexander, Cæsar, and Charlemagne, whose names are still retained on the French cards; that the four queens represent the virtues ascribed to them, birth, piety, fortitude, and wisdom, whose names, Argine, (an anagram of *regina*), Esther, Judith, and Pallas, are also retained on those cards: that the four knaves or valets are their attendants; and that the four suits represent the several orders of men, the ecclesiastics, or *gens de choeur*, being designated by the hearts or *coeurs*, the one term being probably

though he thinks that by them they may have been received from India through Persia, as it is known that the latter was so transmitted. It appears however that, about the time of Charles V. of France, the figures and suits of the original cards underwent a change, those which are now generally used being then introduced. The queen in particular appears to have been made a character in the game by the gallantry of the French people.

Some other aid of public morals was also required, both more operative in its own nature, and fitted to act upon the coarser and more promiscuous intercourse of the dissipated and the vulgar, especially when a great extension of commerce should have diffused through the lower classes of society the means of procuring such gratifications, as might be purchased with money. It accordingly so happened, that the same discovery of a new continent, which powerfully excited the commercial activity of Europe[18], did also com-

by a pun substituted for the other, the soldiers by the spades, or spear-heads (the Spanish cards having *espadas* or swords), the artisans by the diamonds, or rather squared stones, and the farmers by the clubs or trefoil, the names of clubs being probably taken from the *bastos* (staves or clubs) exhibited on the Spanish cards instead of trefoil.

[18] A disorder certainly had existed in Europe, which bore a considerable resemblance to the venereal disease. This appears from the regulations of licensed brothels, and also from some particular occurrences mentioned in history. A countess of Sicily, who went to Jerusalem, to be married to Baldwin II. king of that city, was found to be thus afflicted, it is said indeed with a cancer, and sent home.—Malmsb., fol. 84. Ladislaus king of Naples was in the year 1414 attacked by such a disorder, probably occasioned by his excesses, and died of it, together with his mistress.—Hist. des Répub. Ital., tome viii. p. 217. We must however conclude that the disorder was not of the same nature, as the new malady was not at first supposed to be the result of incontinence, but was believed to be an epidemic, caused by an impure atmosphere. Fracastoro, born at Verona in the year 1484, has chosen this disorder as the subject of a very elegant poem in the Latin language, to which, from the name of the shepherd Syphilus, he has given the title Syphilis. 'Ilceus, an inoffensive inhabitant of the pastoral scenes of Syria, afflicted with a malady, of which he knows neither the cause nor the cure, prays for relief to the rural deities, and especially to Callirhoe, the nymph who is supposed to preside over a fountain remarkable for the medicinal and salubrious qualities of its waters.' Callirhoe informs him, that he had offended Diana by killing a sacred stag, that Apollo had sent this disease as his punishment, and that he should seek relief in a gloomy cave, into which the beams of Apollo could not reach. He follows her direction, and in this cave he is thrice bathed in that liquid metal, which is still the remedy.—Gresswell's Mem. of Politianus, &c., p. 478.

municate a disease, which powerfully repressed its licentiousness[19]. Conveyed from Hispaniola to Spain, it first appeared at Barcelona in the year 1493; from Spain it was speedily transmitted to Naples by the intercourse subsisting between the two countries, united under the same dominion; and in the following year it was contracted by the French army, which had invaded that kingdom, and by the retreat of that army was introduced into France and Germany. So rapid was its propagation, that within five years from its first appearance it was spread over Spain, Italy, France, Germany, Scotland, and England.

The importance of this disease, as a restraint of licentiousness, is sufficiently illustrated by the extraordinary rapidity, with which it was so widely communicated. It is admitted indeed that, at its first appearance the virulence of the disease was much greater than at present; and that the Lansquenets of Charles VIII. of France, being composed of men of various countries[20], might, when they had been disbanded, convey it rapidly to different places. But the grand cause of the rapidity of communication was the inconceivable depravation of morals. Not only were houses of prostitution numerous in every city, and sanctioned by formal regulations of a police, to which they were subjected; but we are informed that creditors who had thrown their debtors into confinement were obliged to allow them the company of prostitutes, as a necessary indulgence. The same corruption of morals, which was thus authorised in general society, had also penetrated into the retreats of those who had professed to devote themselves to religion, for we are assured by Nicholas de Clemangis, the rector of the university of Paris, that the convents had become public brothels[21], and Ambrosius Camaldulensis, who, as abbot of the order of Camaldoli, visited several convents in Italy, found the profligacy of their inhabitants so extreme, that he judged it expedient to describe it in the Greek rather than in the Latin language. In Strasburgh licentiousness prevailed to such an excess, that prostitutes established themselves even in the churches, so that they received the appellation of *the swallows* of the cathedral.

[19] Observ. sur l'Origine de la Maladie Vénérienne. Mém. de l'Institute Nat., tome iv. [20] Philippe de Comines, liv. viii. ch. 14.
[21] Bayle, art. Camaldoli.

The gratification afforded by the fine arts is not very closely connected with the efforts of the understanding, nor can the moralist bestow on it the name of virtue; but it renders society more agreeable, and man more social, and it may even be considered as auxiliary to good morals, by withdrawing the mind from coarser indulgences. Perhaps however this gratification should rather be considered as important in its influence on the industry, than on the moral or intellectual character of a people. When society has been rendered more splendid, a desire is created for various objects, which employ and exercise the industry of the lower orders of the community; and a general elegance is thus diffused over all the productions of manufacturing skill, which disposes all classes to seek in them for something more than mere accommodation.

Architecture exhibited symptoms of re-animation before the other fine arts[22], perhaps because its excellence depends more upon the energy of the mind, than upon practices of imitation. Venice and Pisa, which preceded the other cities of northern Italy in liberty, preceded them also in constructing temples with architectural magnificence. In the former the church of saint Mark was completed about the year 1071; and in the latter the dome of Pisa was finished about the close of the century. From Pisa a taste for this art was spread through Tuscany, the people of that city being enabled by their commercial intercourse to study the models which antiquity had left, and to procure the richest marbles for their own edifices.

The kindred art of sculpture[23] was indebted for its revival to Pisa, Buenanno having in the year 1180 cast a magnificent gate of bronze for its celebrated dome. To the Pisans indeed both this art and architecture were long confined, for the greatest architects of the thirteenth century were either Pisans, or educated among them, and the gates of one of the entrances of the baptistery of Florence[24], which far ex-

[22] Hist. des Répub. Ital., tome iv., pp. 174, &c. [23] Ibid., pp. 180, 181. [24] It is curious, says Sismondi, tome iv. p. 181, to compare them with the gates of the *basilica* of saint Paul without the walls of Rome, a deformed and barbarous performance of the reign of the great Theodosius, undertaken by the first sculptors of the age, under the direction of the most powerful monarch of Christendom, with the inimitable models of antiquity on every side, but where despotism alone

ceeded in beauty that of the dome of Pisa, were executed by a Pisan artist at the close of that century.

Florence may claim the restoration, as well as the perfection, of the art of painting. Some painters[25] had in the twelfth century introduced into Italy the barbarous style then practised by the Greeks, in which harsh outlines exhibited, with stiff and awkward attitudes, figures in profile, and a ground of gold gave a gaudy relief. Cimabue, born at Florence in the year 1240, saw these rude productions of the art with the eye of genius, and, though he received the lesson of the Greeks, soon learned from the observation of nature to excel his masters. His scholar Giotto, whose talent he had accidentally discovered, as it was displayed in designing upon the ground, when the peasant-boy was engaged in tending sheep, gave new propriety and dignity to the art. This artist first animated the heads of figures with the expression of the passions; he threw their draperies into more natural folds; he discovered in part the rules of fore-shortening; and he adopted a general softness, which Cimabue had never possessed.

These however were but the beginnings of the modern arts, and for their perfect state we must look to Florence at the close of the fifteenth century, when Lorenzo de Medici had formed there a collection of those precious remains of antiquity, which still attested the grandeur of conception inspired by ancient liberty. Anxious to excite a better taste[26] among the artists of his own age by proposing to their imitation these reliques of genius, he appropriated his gardens to the establishment of an academy for the study of the antique, and not content with freely offering the opportunity of examining the models of ancient art, he allowed to the poorer students competent stipends for their support, and encouraged their diligence by considerable rewards. The

had been sufficient to repel civilisation, and to stifle every species of genius. The gates of saint Paul, he adds, are not sculptured in relief, but merely engraved, the outlines of the figures being marked with silver; the workmanship seems to be a monument of the impotency of the art, though assisted by wealth. The gates of the baptistery of Florence, on the contrary, are in *alto relievo*, distributed into compartments forming so many finished subjects, and of admirable execution.

[25] Hist. des Répub. Ital., tome iv. pp. 182, 183. [26] Roscoe's Life of Lorenzo de Medici, vol ii. p. 201.

gardens of Lorenzo de Medici have accordingly been celebrated by Vasari as the nursery of men of genius; and there in particular was formed the taste of Michelagnolo, or Michael Angelo, whose tomb was justly decorated by his disciples with the three wreaths of painting, sculpture, and architecture[27], and whose grandeur of imagination[28] at once effected a revolution in the two imitative arts.

The chief merit of this extraordinary artist, it has been well observed, should not be sought in his paintings, or in his sculptures, but was evidenced in the sudden regeneration of the public taste. To this end his genius was particularly accommodated. Daring in his conceptions beyond the limits of actual existence, he presented to his contemporaries an ideal form of excellence until that time unapprehended, rousing them with the authority of one, who could excite new feelings. Raffaelle, surnamed the divine, supplied in painting that affecting grace, which could not be exhibited by the commanding boldness of Michael Angelo. Of a mind not sufficiently vigorous to effect itself the reformation of the art, he was however in this respect well qualified to

[27] Filippo Brunelleschi, employed and patronised by Cosmo de Medici, was the first, according to Mr. Roscoe, who attempted to restore the Grecian in the place of the Gothic architecture.—Life of Lorenzo, vol. i. p. 61. Mr. Greswell however has remarked, that Leo Battista Alberti, patronised by Lorenzo, had been considered as deserving the credit of this reformation, and had been accordingly named the Florentine Vitruvius.—Mem. of Politianus, &c., p. 71. Of the Gothic architecture, which chiefly occupied the interval between the decay and the restoration of this art, it may be remarked, that the pointed arch first appeared in the reign of Stephen, which was begun in the year 1135 and ended in the year 1154, but that the Norman style (an improvement of the Saxon, which was an imitation of the Roman) was not wholly rejected before the reign of Edward I., which was begun in the year 1272. The termination of this pure style of Gothic architecture may be placed about the commencement of the reign of Henry IV., or about the year 1399.—Brewster's Edinb. Encyclop., art. *Architecture.*

[28] 'Perhaps,' says Mr. Roscoe, 'a more involuntary homage was never paid to genius, than that which was extorted from the sculptor Falconet, who, having presumed upon all occasions to censure the style of Michelagnolo, without having had an opportunity of inspecting any of his works, at length obtained a sight of two of his statues, which were brought into France by cardinal Richelieu. *I have seen Michelagnolo*, exclaimed the French artist; *he is terrific.* The pieces, which occasioned this exclamation, were two of the statues intended to compose a part of the monument of Julius II.'—Life of Lorenzo, vol. ii. p. 208, note.

assist its progress, while even he[29], in the improvement of his own productions, after he had been animated by the example of the great reformer, attested the superiority of that creative artist. In comparing the formation of the modern poetry of Italy with the restoration of the arts, we may perhaps be disposed to consider Michael Angelo as corresponding to Dante, and Raffaelle to Petrarch. The arts of Italy had no prose, and for the Boccacio of painting we should look to that Dutch school, which confined itself to the faithful representation of ordinary nature.

While the fine arts were thus recovered[30] from the barbarism of a long series of ages, the auxiliary art of engraving was invented, which has given a sort of ubiquity to the designs of the painter, and more than any other cause has diffused throughout Europe a correct taste for the efforts of imitative genius. The discovery[31] has been commonly attributed to Maso, or Tomaso, Finiguerra, a goldsmith of Florence, who, being accustomed to engrave in metals for the purpose of inlaying, occasionally made trial of his work by taking impressions, first in sulphur, and afterwards on paper. It does not however appear that Finiguerra ever thought of any other use, which could be made of this process, than that of ascertaining the progress of his own work of engraving. Another goldsmith, Baccio Baldini, possessing a more reflecting mind, having received some suitable

[29] 'It was well known that the works of this exquisite master form two distinct classes, those which he painted before, and those which he painted after, he had caught from the new Prometheus a portion of the ethereal fire.'—Life of Lorenzo, vol. ii. pp. 209, 210.

[30] Mr. Craig is of opinion, that the art of painting has been improved by the moderns much beyond the best performances of the ancients. 'Composition, light and shadow, and colouring, are all indispensable, and these,' says he, 'I very much incline to think, they possessed in a very limited degree. The grouping in those specimens of ancient paintings, that have reached us, seems to have gone no farther, than arranging all the figures in a row, nearly on the same base line, sometimes almost without varying the distances between them; and their greatest efforts, that I have seen, extend no further than sometimes bringing two figures together, placing one in a sitting or recumbent position. These are mostly on a perfectly black ground, and have no variation of distance supposed in the objects.'—Lectures on Drawing, &c., p 203. Lond., 1821. [31] Roscoe's Life of Lorenzo, vol. ii. p. 222.

drawings from an artist, engraved on metals[32] with the sole view of communicating impressions to paper. So rapid was the improvement of the art, that, though Finiguerra lived after the middle of the fifteenth century, the numerous productions of Raffaelle were in the beginning of the sixteenth committed to paper with an accuracy, which was satisfactory to his own elevated fancy.

Another art, that of printing, was invented about the middle of the fifteenth century, which has exercised the most powerful influence in forming the intellectual, and even the political character of European society, by indefinitely multiplying the opportunities of information. But, great as was the importance of this discovery, its origin is obscured[33] by much uncertainty, more than fifteen cities[34] having advanced pretensions to the honour of having given it birth, and a yet greater number of persons[35] having obtained the credit of the invention.

The art of printing from engraved blocks or plates is of very ancient and various origin. By Cyprian[36] and Minutius Felix it has been ascribed to Saturn ; by Licimander it is asserted that Charlemagne, in his anxiety for the preservation of the ancient laws and songs of the Germans, caused them to be engraved on wood, and from these engravings to be stamped upon parchment and paper ; and it is generally admitted, that at least before the tenth century the Chinese

[32] It is however certain, that we have impressions on paper from a plate of some kind of metal, engraved in Germany, or Flanders, in the same year, which has been assigned for the discovery of the Florentine goldsmith.—Craig's Lectures, p. 39. [33] Analyse des Opinions Diverses sur l'Origine de l'Imprimerie, Mém. de l'Instit. Nat., tome iv. [34] Augsburg, Basle, Bologna, Dordrecht, Feltri, Florence, Haerlem, Lubeck, Mentz, Nuremberg, Rome, Russemburg, Strasburg, Schelestad, Venice, &c. Of these however Haerlem, Strasburg, and Mentz are entitled to the chief consideration.—Ibid.

[35] Castaldi, Coster, Faustus, Gensfleich, Gresmund, Gutemberg, Ulric Han, Mentellin, Jenson, Regiomontanus, Schoeffer, Sweynheym and Pannartz, Louis de Valbesk, &c. Of these Coster, Mentellin, Gutemberg, Faustus, and Schoeffer are the most deserving of attention. —Ibid. [36] Cyprian in a treatise on idols, and Minutius Felix in his Octavius, have said that Saturn first taught in Italy *litteras imprimere et signare nummos*. Licimander (Paneg. in laudem Typographiæ, pp. 595—607, in vol. ii. of the collection of Wolf, Monum. Typogr.) describing the process attributed to Charlemagne, says that one of the books thus printed is preserved in the imperial library at Vienna.

had made so much progress in the art of printing. That the people of China should have been led to this discovery[37] has been ascribed by Sir George Staunton to the peculiar nature of their government, in which distinction was attained, not by military prowess, but by a knowledge of the written morals, history, and policy of the country. Nor do they seem to have been entirely ignorant of the use of moveable types, for when the same character frequently occurs, as in calendars and gazettes, they employ such types occasionally introduced, but formed of wood, and not applied by a press. The written language of China indeed, consisting of[38] eighty thousand characters, is one which deprives moveable types of much of their utility. Tabular printing may have been brought, as the jesuit Mendoza has asserted, from China to Germany by the merchants, who travelled from the former country to the latter through Russia. Italy however, which might also have received it from the orientals, appears to be the country of Europe, in which a rude kind of engraving, as well as the later and finer part of the art, was earliest practised, it having been stated that in the year 1284, or 1285, the actions of Alexander were there represented by its assistance. This indeed is a solitary, and a controverted instance; and the first undoubted and dated specimen is a delineation of saint Christopher bearing an infant Jesus, with a metrical inscription, and the year 1423 at the bottom. But this is still engraving, not typography; and the world was yet ignorant of the art, which in more recent times has effected an intellectual revolution.

Tabular or block printing seems to have been received and cherished in the convents, where it was applied to the multiplication of the images of saints. From the convents it appears to have passed into the world, for the purpose of manufacturing playing-cards, about this time introduced,

[37] Singer's Researches into the History of Playing-Cards, pp. 77, 171. Analyse des Opinions Diverses sur l'Origine de l'Imprimerie, Mém. de l'Instit. Nat., tome iv. [38] Mr. Davies however has stated, that the roots, or original characters of the Chinese, are only 214 in number, and might indeed be reduced to a much smaller amount by a little dissection and analysis; and has added that these roots serve, like our alphabet, for the arrangement of the words in the large Chinese dictionary, compiled more than a hundred years since by order of the emperor Kâng-hy.—The Chinese, etc., vol. ii. pp. 148, 149.

which thus was strangely connected with the history of knowledge. When the art had in this manner become important to commerce, the same artisans employed themselves indifferently in preparing images for the devout, and cards for the idle; they then advanced one step further by applying the process to the preparation of the elementary books in common use, which have been accordingly denominated block-books; and from these block-books, perhaps first produced in the commercial country of Holland, the art of printing with moveable characters was at length happily discovered in Germany[39].

Before the year 1440 Henne, or John, Gœnsfleisch of Sulgeloch, surnamed Gutenburg, had conceived at Strasburg the idea of printing with moveable types; but the contrivance appears to have been perfected by slow degrees, and not even by the original inventor. It is most probable that the first essays of Gutenburg were made with characters engraved in wood, for which he may have afterwards substituted others engraved in metal; to these engraved types succeeded, probably after he had removed to Mentz, types of cast metal formed in moulds, though in an imperfect manner; and finally Schœffer, the son-in-law of Gutenburg, deserved the credit of having devised an improved method of forming the characters, by which he consummated this most valuable discovery. The art thus completed[40] was employed, for the first time, in printing a Latin Bible, which has no date, but appears to have been published between the years 1449 and 1456. A psalter, printed in Mentz in

[39] Moveable characters were certainly known by the ancients, though not applied to the purpose of printing. In the treatise of Cicero de Nat. Deor. lib. ii. we find the following passage: hic ego non mirer esse quemquam, qui sibi persuadeat.....mundum effici .....ex concursione fortuitâ. Hoc qui existimet fieri potuisse, non intelligo cur non idem putet, si innumerabiles unius et viginti formæ litterarum vel aureæ, vel qualeslibet, aliquo conjiciantur, posse ex his in terram excussis annales Ennii, ut deinceps legi possint, effici. Quintilian, Instit. Orat., lib. i. cap. i., recommends for the instruction of children eburneas litterarum formas in lusum offerre. The transpositions and inversions of letters in some ancient medals have even given occasion to a conjecture, that they had been stamped by separate characters. So slow were men in taking the last step to this important discovery!—Analyse des Opinions Diverses sur l'Origine de l'Imprimerie, Mém. de l'Instit. Nat., tome iv. [40] Ibid.

the year 1457, is the first book, which appears to have been published with a certain date.

This important art was introduced into England before it had been acquired by any other country of the continent. This has been commonly attributed to William Caxton, a mercer and citizen of London, whose occupation connected him with Holland, Flanders, and Germany. It is admitted that he first introduced there the use of cast metallic types, with which he began to print in Westminster Abbey soon after the year 1471. There is reason however for believing, that in the year 1468[41] a book had been printed at Oxford with wooden types by a man named Frederic Corsellis, whom the archbishop of Canterbury, with the assistance of Caxton, had caused to be brought from Haerlem for the purpose. From this time the art was rapidly and widely diffused. In the year 1490 it had reached to Constantinople, and in the middle of the following century it is said to have been extended to Africa and America. In Russia indeed, into which it had been introduced about the year 1560, it was speedily suppressed, whether through policy or through superstition.

Such was the rise, and such the progress of an art, which was the effectual instrument of the Reformation, which is still employed in diffusing into every corner of the world the lights of reason and religion, which has given combination and energy to the public opinion of nations, and has for ever established the security of the human intellect from a second degradation into ignorance and barbarism. If the invention of gunpowder has been considered as giving a fearful sway to the collective force of governments, that of printing has in a far greater degree augmented the power of the people, for it has accomplished in the numerous and wide-spread population of an extensive country what was practised in the simple republics of antiquity, bringing a whole people together into deliberation on all questions of public concern. The art of printing is occasionally perverted to purposes inconsistent with the welfare of society, but its essential and general tendency is to enlighten and to invigorate the social system. The lightning of heaven may wither and destroy; but from the empyreal fire we receive

[41] Encyclopædia Britannica, art. Printing.

the blessings, which it occasionally ravages, and the very existence, by which we are capable of enjoyment.

CHAPTER XV.

Of the predispositions to the Reformation.

The separation from the church of Rome, effected in the earlier part of the sixteenth century, was an event of such grand and decisive importance in the modern history of Europe, in regard not less to its political, than to its religious interests, that we might expect to discover, in the antecedent arrangements of the European system, various tendencies preparing and facilitating the crisis, which in its proper time distinct causes afterwards actually produced. To enquire into these predispositions is the object of the present chapter.

The translator of Mosheim's history has observed[1], that we may gratify the taste of Roman Catholics for tradition and human authority, by urging that our religion had existed in the vallies of Piedmont. It is certain that the inhabitants of these vallies maintained a steady opposition to all the grosser corruptions of the church of Rome, and agreed in many particulars with the leaders of the Reformation. These early separatists from the Roman church were protected by the fastnesses, within which they were sheltered. They have been described by Leger[2], the historian of the

[1] Eccles. Hist. vol. iii. p. 123. Lond. 1782. [2] These are situated on the western side of Piedmont, and are distinguished by the names of Lucerne, Peyrouse, and Saint Martin, all opening towards the east between Exiles and Pignerol. In all these the whole number of men able to carry arms did not amount to more than four or five thousand.—Hist. Gen. des Eglises Vaud., lib. i. ch. i. Leyde, 1669. Mr. Gilly has recently ascertained, that on the French side of the same mountains, within the limits of Dauphinè, there are also two vallies, named Fressinière and Queyras, the latter of which communicates directly with the protestant vallies of Piedmont, sheltering, like those others, primitive Christians, or at least persons testifying their veneration for the holy scriptures, and who had never conformed to the religion of Rome. These are described as more savage and repulsive than the vallies of Piedmont. Gilly's Mem. of Felix Neff, pastor of the High Alps. Lond. 1833.

churches of Piedmont, as singularly accommodated to the purpose of defence. Our eternal God, says he, speaking of the principal valley, who had destined this country to be in an especial degree the theatre of his wonders, and the asylum of his religion, has naturally and wonderfully fortified it. The separatists appear to have been also protected by the sterility of their vallies, for it was soon discovered[3], that to banish from them those who had there sought security, would condemn to barrenness places, which only the industry of a population brought thither by a principle so powerful could render productive. This natural asylum for oppressed separatists moreover was placed on the common frontier of Italy, the country of the papal power, and of France the central and primary member of the western system, so as to be most conveniently situated for sheltering and cherishing the seeds of a future reformation. The local disposition therefore of the vallies of Piedmont may fairly be considered as a primordial arrangement, preparatory to the great revolution, which in the sixteenth century of the Christian era was begun by the piety and the energy of a monk of Germany.

That these fastnesses however were not fitted to originate a religious revolution, sufficiently appears from the tenacity, with which the forest-cantons of Swisserland adhered to the religion of their fathers, while their brethren of the lowland districts embraced the new doctrine of Zuingle. Though therefore the vallies of Piedmont may be regarded as an asylum naturally provided for sheltering and protecting a body of separatists from the church of Rome, until the west should have been prepared for the struggles of the Reformation, some special occasion must have occurred to dispose a number of such separatists to seek shelter in those almost inviolable retreats. That occasion appears to have been the same, which gave being to the independence of the papacy, and to the re-establishment of the imperial dignity, thus preparing at once all the original combinations, from which were afterwards gradually developed the various arrangements of the interests of Europe. The operations of man, limited and imperfect as their author,

[3] Hist. Gen. des Eglises Vaud., partie i. p. 158.

have each some single object, which they attain with difficulty and uncertainty; those of God, extended through a boundless universe, fulfil at once a variety of the purposes of his wisdom.

In the contest concerning image-worship, which in the eighth century distracted the church, the Roman pontiff, espousing the cause of idolatry, renounced his allegiance to the Greek emperor, and sought among the French that support which he found necessary for resisting the attacks of the Lombards. The French however, though they supported the pontiff against the Lombards, did not implicitly adopt his sentiments in regard to images. The abuse, which had in Greece been the offspring of the lively imagination of its people, was cherished in Rome as a useful expedient of sacerdotal influence; but the simplicity of the barbarian conquerors of Gaul was not easily reconciled to a practice[4], which was not at all congenial to their ancient usages. Charlemagne accordingly convened at Frankfort a synod, which condemned the worship of images, and caused a treatise, maintaining the same principle, to be addressed in his name to the Roman pontiff. Among those[5], who at this time strenuously resisted the introduction of idolatry, was Claude, one of the most confidential counsellors of Charlemagne, who in the year 815 was, at the desire of his son Lewis the *debonnair*, constituted archbishop of Turin. The appointment of such a prelate to a see, which comprehended the vallies of Piedmont, is naturally considered by the historian of the separatists of those vallies, as the epoch of their alienation from the see of Rome. Subsequent prelates conformed to the practice of that church, and the mass of the people imitated their example; but some persons would retain, and transmit to their descendants, the principles of a purer worship, and would naturally seek refuge in fastnesses, in which the arm of persecution could not easily reach them.

The doctrines of these primitive Protestants have been traced back as far as the year 1100[6], at which time they ap-

[4] Tacitus de Moribus Germ., cap. 9. [5] Leger, partie i. p. 132.

[6] This appears from an extract, given by Leger, of an old poem entitled La Noble Leiçon, bearing the date of that year:

Ben ha mil et cent ans compli entierament,
Che fu scritta loro que sen al derier temp.

Mr. Hallam, who is disposed to refer the name and origin of the Wal-

pear to have been orthodox[7]. Shut up however in the vallies of Piedmont, though they might preserve the tradition of a purer form of Christianity, they could not be active in recommending it to the acceptance of the world. For this purpose it seems to have been necessary, that there should be exterior members of the sect in some more exposed situation, from which, when they should have attained a certain maturity as a religious party, they might by persecution be scattered over the west. It seems to have been also necessary, that these exterior Waldenses should be blended with other sectaries, whose religious opinions were less pure than their own. As they were not protected by those natural defences, which secured the inhabitants of the vallies, they would have been exposed to the moral danger of being confounded in the prevalent corruptions of the church, if they had not been strengthened in their distinctness by associating with others, who were opposed to it by the strong agency of extreme and heretical opinions. The facts adduced by the historian of the Roman empire[8], to prove that the Reformation was derived from one of those classes of heretics, may all be admitted, though the inference must be denied. These heresies were but protecting outworks of the faith of the true fathers of the Reformation, which was itself strong in the sincerity of religious conviction.

In the south-eastern provinces of France, which[9] long maintained an almost entire independence, the doctrine of Arius concerning the divine nature, introduced and trans-

denses to Waldo of Lyons, rather than to the *vallies* of Piedmont, contends that the passage may suit with any epoch preceding the termination of the twelfth century, but it appears to be sufficiently precise. The translator of Mosheim thinks that Waldo obtained his surname because he had adopted the opinions of the inhabitants of the vallies, in the language of Piedmont named *vaux*, whence the people are named *Vaudois*. The inquisitor Reinerus Sacco, he remarks, lived but about eighty years after Valdus, or Waldo of Lyons, and yet speaks of the Leonists his followers, so named from the city of Lyons, as having flourished more than five hundred years, and even mentions authors of credit, who trace them back to the age of the apostles.—Mosh. Eccles. Hist., vol. iii. p. 123, note. [7] Leger, pp. 58, &c. [8] Decline and Fall, &c., ch. liv. [9] Henault, speaking of the year 1156, and some subsequent years, says that these provinces were continually the theatre of private wars among the several princes and lords, all of them vassals of the crown, but too powerful to be restrained by the royal authority.

mitted by the Goths, continued to support an ecclesiastical opposition down to the time, when the reason of Europe began to recover from the stupid insensibility of barbarism, and the accumulated abuses of the church, the work of a dark and ignorant period, began to offend the understanding and the moral feeling of mankind, and to challenge resistance. Nor did the doctrine of Arius supply a mere principle of dissent and opposition. A sect, whose principle it was to reduce the doctrines of revelation to the standard of human reason, was naturally disposed to give free exercise to the reasoning power, and thus to cherish a spirit of hardy independence, which would necessarily be hostile to the abuses of a superstitious and corrupted establishment.

Causes remote and peculiar sent into the same provinces from the distant region of Armenia another sect, whose principles appear to have received a deep tincture from the ancient philosophy of the east, as those of the Arians were coloured by the philosophy of Greece. The two subjects, on which the human mind is most disposed to speculate, are the nature of the divinity, and the administration of his moral government. Of these the former engaged the attention of Plato and his followers among the Greeks[10], and among the sages of the east the grand inquiry related to the origin of evil[11]. The oriental philosophy, originally promulgated in the east, and long despised and neglected by the reasoners of Europe, first corrupted the simple truths of Christianity. The *gnostic* sects, so denominated from their vain pretension to a superior knowledge of divine things, were accordingly formed in the first century of the Christian era, so that they have been even noticed in the apostolic writings; whereas Origen, who first introduced into the religion of Christ an admixture of the Grecian philosophy, flourished in the third[12].

[10] Plato taught the doctrine of a trinity, composed of a Supreme Being, his reason or *logos*, and a soul of the world. [11] The ancient *magi*, of whose system Zoroaster probably was but the reformer, held that there were two eternal beings, God and matter, and that matter was animated, and possessed a power of producing beings subject to its own imperfections. They seem to have acknowledged in the region of matter a chief or prince, who had in this region a power almost equal to that, which God had in his own kingdom.—Hist. de Manichée par Beausobre, tome i. pp. 162—168. Amst. 1734. [12] Mosh., cent. iii. part ii. ch. iii.

These oriental sects, which referred to an evil principle the Jewish dispensation, together with the creation of the world, and rejected not only the belief of the resurrection of our corporeal frames, but also the reality of the human form of our Redeemer, and consequently of his sufferings, had sunk under the united efforts of the Christians and the Platonists[13], when Manes, a Persian of the province of Babylon or Chaldea, who was born in the year 240[14], undertook to form a new combination of Christianity with the philosophy of his country[15]. In this combination he assumed to himself the character of that Comforter, whom Jesus had promised to his followers, applied to our Lord the characters and actions, which his countrymen attributed to their God Mithras, and rejecting the greater part of the sacred books of our religion, boldly supplied their place with a new gospel, filled with the reveries of his own imagination[16]. The sect, which he thus founded, did not enjoy a long pros-

[13] Mosh., cent. iii. part ii. ch. v. [14] Hist. de Manichée, tome i. p. 65. [15] Mosheim, vol. i. p. 300. Beausobre, tome i. pp. 263, &c., admits that he availed himself of the promise of the Comforter, but denies that he ever assumed to be himself the Comforter. Augustin remarks, that the promises of Christ had furnished the Manicheans with a pretext for saying, either that Manes was the Comforter, or that the Comforter was in Manes. The two propositions are indeed very different, as Beausobre has observed, the latter being consistent with the supposition of the simple humanity of the impostor. He always described himself as the apostle of Christ; but he appears to have conceived, agreeably to the representation of Mosheim, that the Comforter was an apostle favoured with an especial inspiration, and not the Holy Spirit itself. The great error of Manes was, that he supposed matter to be eternal, and to possess life, movement, and sensibility; from which it followed, that God was not necessary for forming organised and animated bodies.—Hist. de Manichée, tome i. p. 495. [16] He rejected almost all the books of the Old Testament, and from the New the Acts of the Apostles; nor does the canon of the sect appear to have admitted the second epistle of Peter, the epistle of Jude, the second and third of John, or the Apocalypse. The Old Testament he appears to have rejected, because it was not consistent with his philosophical system. The Acts of the Apostles he probably chose to reject, because it contained an account of the fulfilment of the promise of the Comforter, though the cause may have been simply that this book had not in the eastern church as much authority as the Gospels and Epistles. The other parts of the New Testament, which he did not acknowledge, were probably not in his time, nor long afterward, acknowledged by the oriental Christians, and on this account probably had not come under his consideration.—Ibid., liv. i. ch. iii. v.

perity, being overpowered by the combined hostility of the followers of Christ and of Zoroaster, and Manes was himself put to death, probably to gratify the *magi*.

Though Manicheism was too extravagant to maintain itself long in the minds of men, a moderated doctrine of the same kind was generated from it, which extended itself from Armenia into western Europe, where it subsisted even to the thirteenth century. The sect of the Paulicians had its origin in Armenia in the year 653[17], when a deacon, who had been a prisoner in Syria, returning home through that country, requited the kind hospitality of an obscure Armenian of the Manichean sect, by presenting him with copies of the Gosples and of the Epistles of Saint Paul, which he had brought out of the country of his captivity. The Armenian, struck by the force of truth, rejected his Manicheism for Christianity, but secretly influenced by the very notions which he renounced, he incorporated many of them with his new profession[18], and thus became the founder of a new sect of heretics, who received their appellation from one Paulus a proselyte, and probably cherished it with a reference to the name of the apostle, whose epistles they especially respected.

Violently persecuted by the imperial court of Constantinople, this sect was transplanted from Asia into Thrace, whence they penetrated into Bulgaria; and in the eleventh century, having been again attacked in Thrace, they mi-

[17] Petrus Siculus, Bibl. Mag. Patr., tome xvi. pp. 814—825.

[18] Petrus Siculus has enumerated six heresies of the Paulicians. 1. They maintained the existence of two deities, the one evil and the creator of this world, the other good and the author of that which is to come. 2. They refused to worship the Virgin, and asserted that Christ brought his body from heaven. 3. They rejected the Lord's Supper. 4. They also rejected the adoration of the cross. 5. They denied the authority of the Old Testament; but admitted the New, except the epistles of Peter, and perhaps the Apocalypse. 6. They did not acknowledge the order of priests.—Hallam's State of Europe during the Middle Ages, vol. ii. p. 528. Mosheim has remarked, that they were distinguished from the Manicheans, 1. In not having an ecclesiastical government administered by bishops, priests, and deacons; 2. In receiving all the books of the New Testament except the epistles of Peter; 3. In having their copies of the Gospel free from all interpolation.—Eccles. Hist., vol. ii. p. 367. It might be added that they rejected the pretended mission of Manes.

grated through Hungary and Bavaria, following the course of the Danube[19], then a great channel of the commerce of Constantinople, or took the route of Lombardy into Swisserland and France. The Albigenses, who received their appellation from Albi a town of Languedoc, appear to have sprung from these Paulicians, and to have retained much of their peculiar doctrine. It has even been stated by M. Paris, that they acknowledged an antipope or primate, established on the borders of Bulgaria, Croatia, and Dalmatia.

The records of the Romish Inquisition, by which the Albigenses were persecuted in common with the Waldenses, sufficiently prove that an important distinction existed between the two sects, and that, while the Waldenses were attacked rather as enemies of the temporal greatness of the church, the Albigenses were opposed as adversaries of its faith, together with its establishments. The errors of the Albigenses were however such as naturally tended to render them hostile to the corrupt practices of that church, for under the influence of their Manichean principles they regarded as a duty the observance of an austere mortification, and rejected the adoration of the cross with the worship of the Virgin.

Protestant writers have been solicitous to prove, that the Albigenses have been traduced by their adversaries of the Romish church, and really professed the pure principles of Christianity. The historian of the Roman empire on the other hand has laboured to prove that the Reformation has had through them a Manichean origin. The historian is correct in his statement of the origin and tenets of this sect, but his inference concerning the origin of the Reformation is fallacious. Three different sects appear to have been engaged together in the resistance[20], which the abuses of the

[19] Hallam's State of Europe during the Middle Ages, vol. ii. p. 528.

[20] Erant quidam Ariani, quidam Manichæi, quidam etiam Waldenses sive Lugdunenses, qui, licet inter se dissides, omnes tamen in animarum perniciem contra fidem catholicam conspirabant; et illi quidem Waldenses contra alios acutissime disputant.—Du Chesne, tome v. p. 666. Alanus, in his second book, where he treats of the Waldenses, charges them principally with disregarding the authority of the church, and preaching without a regular mission. It is evident however from the acts of the Inquisition, that they denied the existence of purgatory. The difference, made in these records between the Waldenses and the

church of Rome encountered in the twelfth century; the Waldenses, the Arians, and the Albigenses. Of these the Waldenses appear to have been irreproachable in doctrine, and entitled to be considered as the true fathers of the Reformation. The Arian descendants of the Goths, and the Paulician sect of the Albigenses, were auxiliaries indeed, but were united in the same cause only as they were opposed to a common adversary. Among themselves these sects, however combined in their opposition to Rome, were by no means united, the Waldenses strenuously maintaining their own orthodox opinions against the Arians on the one part, and on the other against the Albigenses. Still the common war was waged with vigour; the Waldenses combated their adversaries with the persuasive force of simple truth, the Arians encountered them with the confidence of human reasoning, and the Albigenses with the imposing austerity of Manichean mortification.

The Waldenses of the French provinces, however supported by these other sects, were at length forced to yield to persecution; but in their dispersion they sowed more widely the seeds of the future reformation. Their dispersion began in the year 1180[21], when Peter Waldo of Lyons, who probably had derived his surname from the sect to which he belonged, was driven from his home by the Roman pontiff and the archbishop of Lyons, and compelled to seek a retreat, first in the Netherlands and Picardy, and finally in Bohemia. In this country he and his followers assisted in preparing the people for the preaching of Huss; and it has accordingly been expressly stated, that the Bohemian churches, while they acknowledged that Huss had been excited by the writings of Wicliffe, considered themselves as having received their doctrines more immediately from the Waldenses. The final dispersion of the sectaries of these provinces was effected about a half-century afterwards. Raymond VI., earl of Thoulouse[22], had drawn upon himself, by protecting them, the vengeance of the Roman pon-

Manichean sects, shows on the other hand that the imputations cast upon the latter were not indiscriminate calumnies.—See Limborch, pp. 201, 268, in Hallam's State of Europe during the Middle Ages, vol. ii. p. 532. [21] Leger, liv. i. ch. 25. [22] Mosheim, cent. xiii. part ii. ch. 5.

tiff Innocent III., who accordingly in the year 1206 dispatched his legates to crush the rising heresies. From this commencement was gradually formed the execrable tribunal of the Inquisition, completed by the succeeding pontiff in the year 1233, the only sure support of a system, which denies to mankind the liberty of thought in regard to their most important interests. The original Waldenses of the vallies in the mean time[23] retained a sort of supremacy over their scattered brethren, being respected as the primitive congregations of the sect. To these vallies accordingly, as to a university, those who were intended for holy orders, were sent to study their profession; and from them missionaries were occasionally sent, even into distant countries, to form new churches, or to visit and superintend those which had been already constituted.

Together with the heresies generated by the Grecian and the oriental philosophy, the false religion of Mohammed may also claim to have exercised some influence in assisting the reformation of corrupted Christianity. That religion, it has been well observed[24], has been from its commencement the unceasing censor of the perversions of the Christian faith. Just when the religion of Christ was sinking under its manifold abuses, a false religion was established in the world with distinguished celebrity, which opposed the utmost simplicity of worship to the superstitions of a paganised ritual, its leading tenet of the unity of the divine nature to the deification of the Virgin with a crowd of other saints, and the almost entire absence of a priesthood to a numerous, opulent, and domineering hierarchy. That the doctrines of that religion excited the curiosity of Christians is sufficiently proved by the fact, that in the twelfth century a French abbot, the friend of Saint Bernard, translated the Koran. That this curiosity, so awakened, was directed to the reformation of the church, may be inferred from the prevalence of reforming opinions in those provinces of France, which were adjacent to the Spanish frontiers. We know indeed that Gerbert, who had resorted to the Mohammedans of Spain for instruction, was in the year 990 so strongly impressed with these opinions, that he proclaimed the pontiff

[23] Leger, liv. i. p. 203. [24] Turner's Hist. of England, vol. i. pp. 374, &c.

to be Anti-Christ, 'the man of sin,' mentioned in the Epistle to the Thessalonians; and that from the schools in France, which he instituted, came Berenger, who in the succeeding age attacked the great papal doctrine of transubstantiation. The schoolmen too, whose disputations, vain as they were in themselves, roused from its sleep of ignorance the intellect of Europe, received their arguments and their habits of contention from the Arabian metaphysicians.

To the Greek church too some collateral influence has been already traced[25], as it affected the minds of those, who inhabited the common border of the two regions, in which the supremacy of the patriarch of Constantinople and that of the Roman pontiff were respectively acknowledged. Bohemia, which had been converted to the religion of Christ by missionaries of the Greek church, but afterwards, on account of its connexion with the German empire, adopted the Roman ritual, fluctuated during about two centuries between the two systems. Near the close of the twelfth century, while the people of that country were in this unsettled state of religious observance, the Waldenses, driven by persecution from Lyons, arrived among them, and found their minds well prepared to listen to their representations of the abuses of the church of Rome. The Greek church, however distracted by doctrinal dissensions, and disgraced by a gaudy and idolatrous ceremonial, had been preserved from corruption in two important and observable particulars[26]: it permitted the liturgy to be performed in the vernacular language of each of the countries, which received its tenets, and in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper it administered the cup, together with the bread, to the laity. To these peculiarities, which presented themselves to the notice of the most illiterate, the Bohemians had long been exclusively accustomed; and down to the arrival of the Waldenses the

[25] Chapter ii. of this book. [26] The cause of the former of these distinctions probably was that the Greek language continued to be the living speech of the Greeks, whereas the Latin, having ceased to be the language of Italy, was become peculiar to the clergy. The cause of the other was probably that the Greek church had not admitted the doctrine of transubstantiation, of which the retrenchment of the cup appears to have been a consequence. Transubstantiation was the peculiar heresy of the western church. This may have been sufficient to cause the Greeks to reject it.

lower classes still adhered to them, probably with increased attachment on account of the efforts employed to establish the contrary regulations of the Roman church. In such a people the fugitives found many persons well disposed to embrace their principles of dissent. The sect accordingly became numerous, and subsisted to the beginning of the fifteenth century, when many of its members attached themselves to the party of separatists formed[27] at that time by the preaching of Huss.

It was natural that a country, in which materials of resistance had been thus brought together, should become the scene of the earliest struggle of continental reformation. Accordingly a century before Luther, John Huss and Jerome of Prague, having had their zeal excited by the writings of Wicliffe[28], the English patriarch of religious reformation, preached openly in Bohemia the necessity of a formal separation from the church of Rome. Nor was this a transient effort[29] speedily and effectually suppressed, for in this same country, a century after Luther, arose from the same cause that memorable war of thirty years, which terminated in the treaty of Westphalia, the grand adjustment of the political interests of the west.

To these general considerations of predisposing causes must be added that of the personal character of one distinguished individual, whose authority, acknowledged in the Roman church, afforded a powerful support to the leaders of the Reformation. The existence of an individual so peculiarly characterised as Augustin, occurring in the latter part of the fourth century, just as those corruptions were

[27] Mosheim, cent. iv. part ii. chap. iii. [28] It has been observed by the translator of Mosheim, that this must be understood only in relation to the papal hierarchy, the despotism of the court of Rome, and the corruptions of the clergy, it being certain that Huss adhered to the most superstitious doctrines of the church, as appears by two sermons, which he had prepared for the council of Constance.—Eccles. Hist., vol. iii. p. 410, note. [29] So far indeed was it from being transient, that the Hussites have been represented as very numerous in Bohemia at a not distant period. Some think, says Riesbeck, that a fourth part of the inhabitants are of this sect, which was also spread widely in Moravia. Scarce four years are past, he adds, since above ten thousand farmers made a little stand to recover their freedom of opinion, but they were soon quieted, and the thing had no further consequences.—Travels through Germany, vol. i. p. 412.

beginning to prevail, against which in the time of the Reformation his doctrine of justification by faith was found to be the most effectual antidote, may surely be regarded as an event deserving attention in an examination of the causes of that great revolution. The doctrine of Augustin, not disavowed as the faith of Rome, when it was not yet too much perverted by the vain contrivances of priestcraft to consider human efforts as insufficient for salvation, remained through the dark ages of ignorance a beacon to warn the reflecting from the errors of superstitious observances; and among the friars of the Augustinian order at last was found the man, who boldly and successfully arraigned the system, which had substituted these observances for the genuine means of salvation. The great question indeed between the reformers and the Romanists was, whether salvation could be attained by the various devices of superstition and priestcraft, or must depend wholly on the merits and the intercession of Christ. Fortunately for the Reformation it happened, that this father, acknowledged and reverenced in the church of Rome, had long before established the doctrine, that merely human efforts, even of moral righteousness, must be unavailing; and the principle applied itself with yet greater force to the numerous observances, which had been substituted by the priesthood for the reasonable service of a Christian.

This eminent man was born in the Roman province of Africa, and appears to have inherited all the vehemence of character, which is believed to belong to the inhabitants of that region. In his youth his ardent spirit, gratified with the pretended solution of difficulties, engaged him in the heresy of the Manicheans, to which he continued attached during several years, until he was at length recalled to the orthodox faith by the sermons of Ambrose, which he heard at Milan. With the zeal of a proselyte he then became a champion of the church against the heresy, which he had been persuaded to abandon, arguing strenuously for the freedom of the human will in opposition to the fatalism of the Manicheans, who represented every man as having two souls[30], the one derived from the evil principle, and there-

[30] Hist. de Manichée, tome ii. p. 420.

fore necessarily doomed to destruction, the other, having sprung from the good principle, as certainly destined to happiness. Early however in the fifth century he felt himself called to another controversy by the very different heresy of Pelagius, a British monk, who maintained that our nature had experienced no corruption[31], and required not any internal assistance of the divine spirit, for attaining to the highest degrees of piety and virtue, though by external grace it might be usefully excited to exertion. Pelagius, who had gone into Palestine, was protected by the bishop of Jerusalem, whose attachment to the principles of Origen disposed him to countenance the new doctrine, and he was even declared by the Roman pontiff to be sound in the faith. Augustin however, at the head of the bishops of Africa, was steady in his opposition; the pontiff was induced by his representations to relinquish the opinion, which he had pronounced; and the doctrine of Pelagius was condemned and suppressed by the authority of the Roman see. In this other controversy Augustin attacked the freedom of the human will as strenuously, as he had before maintained it against Manichean fatalism, and was hurried into the use of language, which was understood to imply, that God had predestinated not only the punishment of sinners, but also the crimes for which it was to be inflicted. This interpretation of his doctrine however he vehemently denied, and employed all his influence in procuring its rejection.

While all this various enginery was prepared for shaking the dominion of the papacy, that dominion was itself subjected to the action of interior causes of decay, which enfeebled its resistance. In the thirteenth century it had attained its greatest prosperity[32], which may indeed be considered as having been continued through the whole of that age, having begun with Innocent III. and ended with Boniface VIII. The former of these two pontiffs, whose papacy began that century[33], had been successful in accomplishing the three great enterprises of the papal ambition. He first of the pontiffs acquired a dominion over Rome and the central parts of Italy; by the Latin conquest of Constantinople, and the submission of Bulgaria and Armenia, he attained

[31] Mosheim, cent. v. part ii. ch. v. [32] Hallam's State of Europe during the Middle Ages, vol. ii. p. 63. [33] Ibid., p. 57.

the general supremacy of the Christian church; and he realised, after the lapse of more than a hundred years, the bold pretension of Gregory VII. to the general control of princes, asserting to the papacy the same superiority over their power, which the great luminary of the day maintains over the lesser luminaries of the night. But this ecclesiastical domination contained within itself principles of dissolution, yet more than political empires, its consistency and strength being wholly dependent on opinion. The wealth and pomp and ambition of the hierarchy offended the good sense and the piety of the laity, and even incurred the severe reproaches of the mendicant orders of the church; the papal power became at length the object of the great schism, which was begun in the year 1378, and during fifty years exhibited to the astonished nations of the west two, or even three pontiffs, denouncing their anathemas in their mutual contention; and the clergy were generally alienated from the see of Rome by the partiality, which was there manifested for the mendicant orders, by the continually increasing encroachments on the rights of ecclesiastical patronage, and by the oppressive demands of money, required as the revenue of the spiritual empire.

It seems indeed that the temporal dominion of Rome[34], first well established by Innocent III., enfeebled the spiritual influence of the papacy, by exhibiting it as a political power engaged in the ordinary contentions of ambition, and employing the ordinary measures of aggression and resistance. In the three centuries, which have succeeded the Reformation, the possession of the Roman principality has maintained the dignity of the papacy, by preserving the pontiff from becoming dependent on any of the sovereigns of Europe; but in earlier times, when a spiritual empire was raised on the basis of religious opinion, an abstraction from temporal ambition, in a nominal dependence on the empire, was more favourable to the exaltation of the papacy, than a direct engagement in the politics of Italy. This part then of the successes of Innocent III. appears to have acted with a double influence on the papacy, one immediate, the other remote, but each accommodated to the circumstances of its

[34] Hallam's State of Europe during the Middle Ages, vol. ii. pp. 122, 123.

own period, though neither was contemplated by that able and ambitious pontiff. The immediate influence served to discredit the papacy as a spiritual dominion, and thus to facilitate the Reformation; the remote operation made provision for the independence of the papacy in those latter ages, in which the formidable pretensions of the pontiffs were reduced to little more than a pre-eminence in ecclesiastical dignity. The engagement in the political interests of Italy produced its natural effect, in bringing forward base and unworthy men, eager to avail themselves of the opportunity of gratifying an intriguing ambition. It is accordingly observable, that in the latter part of the fifteenth century the papal throne was dishonoured by the extreme profligacy of the pontiffs, especially of the notorious Alexander VI. From the termination of the schism, turning their attention wholly to schemes of temporal aggrandisement of themselves, or of their kindred, the pontiffs forgot the spiritual character, which constituted the real power of their see, and while they were caballing for their own worldly purposes, prepared the way for the Reformation.

The necessity of reforming the church was at length very generally felt even by those who were not at all disposed to secede from it, and various efforts were exerted by them for the purpose; but the result served only to demonstrate the necessity of some important change in the ecclesiastical constitution of Europe. When the papal schism had outraged every serious mind, a council was convened, first at Pisa, afterwards at Constance, to remedy the alarming disorder of the hierarchy. The latter of these assemblies[35], which met in the year 1414, adopted very decisive measures, according to the light which it possessed: it struck deadly blows at the supreme dominion of the papacy, but did nothing for the general amendment of the church. Constituted[36] on a more democratical plan than had been observed

[35] Hallam's State of Europe during the Middle Ages, vol. ii. p. 106

[36] In this council, besides the bishops, sat and voted, not only the chiefs of monasteries, but the ambassadors of all Christian princes, the deputies of universities, a multitude of inferior theologians, and even doctors of law. It was agreed that the ambassadors could not vote upon articles of faith, but only on questions relative to the settlement of the church. But ecclesiastics of the second order were allowed to vote generally. To counteract also the superior number of the Italian

for ages in ecclesiastical councils, this assembly proclaimed that by divine right it possessed authority in matters of faith, and in the reformation of the church, to which even the pontiff was obliged to submit, thus denying to him his infallibility and supreme dominion, which were thenceforward to be exercised by councils convened at stated times[37]. This formidable assault was however eluded without much difficulty, as it was easy for the papal party to avail themselves of the jealousies of the several nations, of which the council was composed; and though the council of Basle, assembled in the year 1433, proceeded in the spirit of that of Constance to abolish various abuses of the papal authority, yet having been induced by the resistance of the pontiff to depose him from his dignity, and to renew the schism by the election of another person to the papacy, it lost the support of the princes of Europe, and frustrated the project of imposing permanent limitations on the papal power by councils periodically convened.

These councils have left to the world no reason for regretting the failure of the plan. The abuses of the papal supremacy might perhaps have been reduced, or even suppressed; but the spiritual domination would have been only transferred from a pope to a council, and no encroachment of ecclesiastical dominion would have been restrained, no corruption of faith or worship would have been purified. The council of Constance has even rendered itself for ever infamous[38] by solemnly recognising the abominable principle that no faith should be observed with Huss to the prejudice of the catholic religion—a memorable example and demonstration of the utter inability of the church of Rome to effect its own reformation. Governments as well as councils, have

bishops, the council was divided into four nations, the Italian, the German, the French, and the English, with equal rights. The Spaniards, who afterwards acceded to the council, were admitted as a fifth nation. —Hist. du Concile de Constance, tome ii. pp. 30, &c. Amst., 1727.

[37] Another was to be assembled at the end of five years, a third at the end of seven more, and from that time a council was regularly to be convened at the end of each interval of ten.—Hallam's State of Europe during the Middle Ages, vol. ii. p. 109.

[38] 'Gerson, the most eminent theologian of his age, and the *coryphæus* of the party, which opposed the transalpine principles, was deeply concerned in this atrocious business.'—Ibid. p. 112.

resisted[39], in a greater or less degree, the usurpations of the papacy, and the domestic usurpations of the clergy have also in some countries of the church of Rome been controlled in subordination to the interest of the state; but the subjugation of the human mind in all its spiritual concerns was of the essence of that church, and accordingly to maintain it by persecution was deemed a sacred duty, and fidelity pronounced to be a crime. Nor was this odious principle avowed only by a council on one solitary occasion, but had before[40] been substantially established in the decretals, the code of the papal dominion, and had been expressly announced by a pontiff.

Nor was the corruption of the church limited to persons placed in exalted stations, and therefore exposed to all the strong temptations of worldly ambition. That the church, as an ecclesiastical system, had become incapable of communicating and maintaining a sentiment of religion among men, and was in truth at once unworthy and unable to exist longer in its actual condition, we have the unquestionable testimony of Bellarmine, its ablest defender, borne too in the presence of its adversaries, for he wrote after the Reformation. 'For some years,' says he[41], 'before the Luthe-

[39] England, the earliest and the most steady opponent of Rome, prepared herself in this manner for that temperate and orderly separation, which was afterwards accomplished. Germany, baffled in her efforts for independence, prepared the occasion for the statement of *the hundred grievances*, presented to Adrian VI. by the diet of Nuremberg. France so moderated the control of the church, as to render its authority tolerable and consequently permanent. Spain, adopting in the latter part of the thirteenth century a great part of the decretals into her national code, trained her people on the other hand to become the slaves of the clergy, when the accession of the emperor Charles V. should have connnected that country with the empire, and with the papacy.

[40] It was established in the decretals, that an oath disadvantageous to the church is not binding. Urban VI., advanced to the papacy in the year 1378, issued the following solemn and general declaration against keeping faith with heretics: Attendentes quod hujusmodi confœderationes, colligationes, et ligæ seu conventiones, factæ cum hujusmodi hæreticis seu schismaticis, postquam tales effecti erant, sunt temerariæ, illicitæ, et *ipso jure nullæ* (etsi forte ante ipsorum lapsum in schisma, seu hæresim, initæ, seu factæ fuissent) etiam si forent jura mento vel fide datâ firmatæ, aut confirmatione apostolicâ, vel quâcunque firmitate aliâ roboratæ, postquam tales, utpræmittitur, sunt effecti. —Rymer, t. vii. pp. 352, 353. [41] Concio xxviii. Op., tom. vi.

ran and Calvinistic heresies were published, there was not (as contemporary authors testify) any severity in ecclesiastical judicatories, any discipline with regard to morals, any knowledge of sacred literature, any reverence for divine things; there was not almost any religion remaining.' If in these respects the church of Rome has since been in any degree amended, we must attribute it to the salutary influence of an alarming secession.

When so many causes had co-operated to form a numerous party of Christians adverse to the corruptions of the church of Rome, the special preservation of a small number of uncorrupted Christians, the Arian doctrine of the descendants of the Goths, the Manichean tenets of the Paulicians, the anti-idolatrous spirit of the Arabian imposture, the distinctness of the usages of the Greek church, and the personal character and peculiar circumstances of Augustin; and when that church had both excited by the enormity of its abuses the displeasure of every serious mind, and by actual trial had proved its own inability to effect the reformation, which all good men desired; it pleased the almighty ruler of the world to bring forward, as the chief agent in this most important work, an obscure monk in a distant region, who was beyond the influence of most of these causes[42], but, catching in his monastic seclusion, the first glimpses of the divine light of truth, was urged by the intemperance of his adversaries to question their authority, and unintentionally to become the reformer of Europe.

Perhaps in all the various combinations of the history of the world none is more remote from the anticipations of human conjecture, than that the reformer of the church should appear in such circumstances. It would naturally be expected, that the change would be commenced among those, who had previously manifested the strongest spirit of resistance. Yet how evidently do we now perceive the advantage of that very different combination of events, which

[42] Even in the year 1523, when some of the Bohemians came to him, and explained their doctrine of the Lord's Supper, he declared that he only then ceased to consider them as heretics, still however mentioning some particulars, in which he conceived that their doctrine required correction.—Seckendorf, Comment. de Lutheranismo, lib. i. p. 276. Lipsiæ, 1694.

could not have been foreseen! If the leader of the Reformation had arisen among the Bohemians, what could have occurred but a repetition of the violence, which a century before had distracted their country? When however this important individual appeared first in a monastery of a distant province, remote from all the irritations of preceding struggles, and slowly emancipating himself by the efforts of his own mind from the thraldom of his monastic habits, he might rejoice indeed when he discovered that so many persons so far consented with him in the opinions[43], which he had been gradually led to form for himself, but he could be subject to no extrinsic influence, which might excite him to forget the moderation essential to a sound and useful change of the ecclesiastical arrangements of Europe. The predispositions, which have been examined, gave strength to the cause; the estrangement of the leader from much of their operation gave it temperance and utility.

[43] He expressed his approbation of their opinions relative to the nature and persons of the Divinity, the mediation of Christ, and the office and power of the Holy Spirit; and he commended them for having rejected the traditions of men, purgatory, masses instituted on account of purgatory, and the worship of saints: but he blamed them for denying the real presence of the body of Christ in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and also the faith of infants in baptism, for connecting charity with a saving faith in the work of justification, for acknowledging seven sacraments, and for prohibiting the marriage of the clergy. —Seckendorf, lib. i. p. 276.

END OF VOLUME THE SECOND.

J. BILLING, PRINTER AND STEREOTYPER, WOKING, SURREY.

BOHN'S CLASSICAL LIBRARY.

A Series of Literal Prose Translations of the Greek and Latin Classics with notes and indexes.

Uniform with the Standard Library, 5*s. each (except Thucydides, Æschylus, Virgil, Horace, Cicero's Offices, Demosthenes, Appendix to Æschylus, Aristotle's Organon, all of which are* 3*s.* 6*d. each volume).*

1. **HERODOTUS.** By the Rev. Henry Cary, M.A. *Frontispiece.*
2 & 3. **THUCYDIDES.** By the Rev. H. Dale. In 2 Vols. (*3s.* 6*d.* each). *Frontispiece.*
4. **PLATO.** Vol. I. By Cary. [The Apology of Socrates, Crito, Phædo, Gorgias, Protagoras, Phædrus, Theætetus, Euthyphron, Lysis.] *Frontispiece.*
5. **LIVY'S HISTORY OF ROME,** literally translated. Vol. I., Books 1 to 8.
6. **PLATO.** Vol. II. By Davis. [The Republic, Timæus, and Critias.]
7. **LIVY'S HISTORY OF ROME.** Vol. II., Books 9 to 26.
8. **SOPHOCLES.** The Oxford Translation, revised.
9. **ÆSCHYLUS,** literally translated. By an Oxonian. (Price 3*s.* 6*d.*)
9* ———— Appendix to, containing the new readings given in Hermann's posthumous edition of Æschylus, translated and edited by G. Burges, M.A. (*3s.* 6*d.*).
10. **ARISTOTLE'S RHETORIC AND POETIC.** With Examination Questions.
11. **LIVY'S HISTORY OF ROME.** Vol. III., Books 27 to 36.
12 & 14. **EURIPIDES,** literally translated. From the Text of Dindorf. In 2 Vols.
13. **VIRGIL.** By Davidson. New Edition, Revised. (Price *3s.* 6*d.*) *Frontispiece.*
15. **HORACE.** By Smart. New Edition, Revised. (Price *3s.* 6*d.*) *Frontispiece.*
16. **ARISTOTLE'S ETHICS.** By Prof. R. W. Browne, of King's College.
17. **CICERO'S OFFICES.** [Old Age, Friendship, Scipio's Dream, Paradoxes, &c.]
18. **PLATO.** Vol. III. By G. Burges, M.A. [Euthydemus, Symposium, Sophistes, Politicus, Laches, Parmenides, Cratylus, and Meno.]
19. **LIVY'S HISTORY OF ROME.** Vol. IV. (which completes the work).
20. **CÆSAR AND HIRTIUS.** With Index.
21. **HOMER'S ILIAD,** in prose, literally translated. *Frontispiece.*
22. **HOMER'S ODYSSEY,** Hymns, Epigrams, and Battle of the Frogs and Mice.
23. **PLATO.** Vol. IV. By G. Burges, M.A. [Philebus, Charmides, Laches, The Two Alcibiades, and Ten other Dialogues.]
24, 25, & 32. **OVID.** By H. T. Riley, B.A. Complete in 3 Vols. *Frontispieces.*
26. **LUCRETIUS.** By the Rev. J. S. Watson. With the Metrical Version of J. M. Good.
27, 30, 31, & 34. **CICERO'S ORATIONS.** By C. D. Yonge. Complete in 4 Vols. (Vol. 4 contains also the Rhetorical Pieces.)
28. **PINDAR.** By Dawson W. Turner. With the Metrical Version of Moore. *Front.*
29. **PLATO.** Vol. V. By G. Burges, M.A. [The Laws.]
33 & 36. **THE COMEDIES OF PLAUTUS,** By H. T. Riley, B.A. In 2 Vols.
35. **JUVENAL, PERSIUS, &c.** By the Rev. L. Evans, M.A. With the Metrical Version of Gifford. *Frontispiece.*
37. **THE GREEK ANTHOLOGY,** translated chiefly by G. Burges, A.M., with Metrical Versions by various Authors.
38. **DEMOSTHENES.** The Olynthiac, Philippic, and other Public Orations, with Notes, Appendices, &c., by C. Rann Kennedy. (*3s.* 6*d.*)

39. **SALLUST, FLORUS,** and **VELLEIUS PATERCULUS,** with copious Notes, Biographical Notices, and Index, by the Rev. J. S. WATSON, M.A.

40. **LUCAN'S PHARSALIA,** with copious Notes, by H. T. RILEY, B.A.

41 **THEOCRITUS, BION, MOSCHUS** and **TYRTÆUS,** by the Rev. J. BANKS, M.A. With the Metrical Versions of CHAPMAN. *Frontispiece.*

42. **CICERO'S ACADEMICS, DE FINIBUS** and **TUSCULAN QUESTIONS,** by C. D. YONGE, B.A. With Sketch of the Greek Philosophy.

43. **ARISTOTLE'S POLITICS AND ECONOMICS,** by E. WALFORD, M.A., with Notes, Analyses, Life, Introduction, and Index.

44. **DIOGENES LAERTIUS. LIVES AND OPINIONS OF THE ANCIENT PHILOSOPHERS,** with Notes by C. D. YONGE, B.A.

45. **TERENCE** and **PHÆDRUS,** by H. T. RILEY. To which is added SMART'S Metrical Version of Phædrus. *Frontispiece.*

46 & 47. **ARISTOTLE'S ORGANON,** or, Logical Treatises, and the Introduction of Porphyry, with Notes, Analysis, Introduction and Index, by the Rev. O. F. OWEN, M.A. 2 Vols., 3*s.* 6*d.* per Vol.

48 & 49. **ARISTOPHANES,** with Notes and Extracts from the best Metrical Versions, by W. J. HICKIE, in 2 Vols. *Frontispiece.*

50. **CICERO ON THE NATURE OF THE GODS, DIVINATION, FATE, LAWS, REPUBLIC, &c,** translated by C. D. YONGE, B.A.

51. **APULEIUS.** [The Golden Ass, Death of Socrates, Florida, and Defence or Discourse on Magic]. To which is added a Metrical Version of Cupid and Psyche; and Mrs. Tighe's Psyche. *Frontispiece.*

52. **JUSTIN, CORNELIUS NEPOS** and **EUTROPIUS,** with Notes and a General Index, by the Rev. J. S. WATSON, M.A.

53 & 58. **TACITUS.** Vol. I. The Annals. Vol. II. The History, Germania, Agricola, &c. With Index.

54. **PLATO.** Vol VI., completing the work, and containing Epinomis, Axiochus, Eryxias, on Virtue, on Justice, Sisyphus, Demodocus, and Definitions; the Treatise of Timæus Locrus on the Soul of the World and Nature; the Lives of Plato by Diogenes Laertius, Hesychius, and Olympiodorus; and the Introductions to his Doctrines by Alcinous and Albinus; Apuleius on the Doctrines of Plato, and Remarks on Plato's Writings by the Poet Gray. Edited, with Notes, by G. BURGES, M.A., Trin. Coll., Camb. With general Index to the 6 Volumes.

55, 56, 57. **ATHENÆUS.** The Deipnosophists, or the Banquet of the Learned, translated by C. D. YONGE, B.A., with an Appendix of Poetical Fragments rendered into English verse by various Authors, and a general Index. Complete in 3 Vols.

59. **CATULLUS, TIBULLUS,** and the **VIGIL OF VENUS.** A literal prose translation. To which are added Metrical Versions by LAMB, GRAINGER, and others. *Frontispiece.*

60. **PROPERTIUS,** PETRONIUS ARBITER, and JOHANNES SECUNDUS, literally translated, and accompanied by Poetical Versions, from various sources; to which are added the Love Epistles of ARISTÆNETUS. Edited by W. K. KELLY.

61. **THE GEOGRAPHY OF STRABO,** translated, with copious Notes, by W. FALCONER, M.A., and H. C. HAMILTON, Esq. In 3 Vols. Vol I.

62. **XENOPHON'S ANABASIS,** or Expedition of Cyrus, and **MEMORABILIA,** or Memoirs of Socrates, translated by the Rev. J. S. WATSON, with a Geographical Commentary by W. F. AINSWORTH. *Frontispiece.*

63 ———— CYROPÆDIA and HELLENICS, by the Rev. H. DALE, and the Rev. J. S. WATSON.

BOHN'S CLASSICAL LIBRARY.

64. **PLINY'S NATURAL HISTORY,** translated, with copious Notes, by the late JOHN BOSTOCK, M.D., F.R.S., and H. T. RILEY, Esq., B.A. Vol. 1.

65. **SUETONIUS** Lives of the Cæsars, and other Works. THOMSON'S translation revised by T. FORESTER.

BOHN'S ANTIQUARIAN LIBRARY.

Uniform with the STANDARD LIBRARY, *price 5s.,*

1. **BEDE'S ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY, & THE ANGLO-SAXON CHRONICLE.**
2. **MALLET'S NORTHERN ANTIQUITIES.** By BISHOP PERCY. With Abstract of the Erbyggia Saga, by SIR WALTER SCOTT. Edited by J. A. BLACKWELL.
3. **WILLIAM OF MALMESBURY'S CHRONICLE OF THE KINGS OF ENGLAND.**
4. **SIX OLD ENGLISH CHRONICLES:** viz., Asser's Life of Alfred; the Chronicles of Ethelwerd, Gildas, Nennius, Geoffry of Monmouth, and Richard of Cirencester.
5. **ELLIS'S EARLY ENGLISH METRICAL ROMANCES.** Revised by J. ORCHARD HALLIWELL. Complete in one vol., *Illuminated Frontispiece.*
6. **CHRONICLES OF THE CRUSADERS:** Richard of Devizes. Geoffrey de Vinsauf. Lord de Joinville. Complete in 1 volume. *Frontispiece.*
7. **EARLY TRAVELS IN PALESTINE.** Willibald, Sæwulf, Benjamin of Tudela, Mandeville, La Brocquiere, and Maundrell. In one volume. *With Map.*
8, 10, & 12. **BRAND'S POPULAR ANTIQUITIES OF GREAT BRITAIN.** By SIR HENRY ELLIS. In 3 Vols.
9 & 11. **ROGER OF WENDOVER'S FLOWERS OF HISTORY** (formerly ascribed to Matthew Paris.) In 2 Vols.
13. **KEIGHTLEY'S FAIRY MYTHOLOGY.** Enlarged. *Frontispiece* by CRUIKSHANK.
14, 15, & 16. **SIR THOMAS BROWNE'S WORKS.** Edited by SIMON WILKIN. *Portrait.* In 3 Vols. With Index.
17, 19, & 31. **MATTHEW PARIS'S CHRONICLE,** containing the History of England from 1235, translated by DR. GILES, with Index to the whole, including the portion published under the name of ROGER OF WENDOVER, in 3 Vols. (See 9 & 11). *Portrait.*
18. **YULE-TIDE STORIES.** A collection of Scandinavian Tales and Traditions, edited by B. THORPE, Esq.
20 & 23. **ROGER DE HOVEDEN'S ANNALS OF ENGLISH HISTORY,** from A.D. 732 to A.D. 1201. Translated and edited by H. T. RILEY, Esq., B.A. In 2 Vols.
21. **HENRY OF HUNTINGDON'S HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH,** from the Roman Invasion to Henry II.; with The Acts of King Stephen, &c. Translated and edited by T. FORESTER, Esq., M.A.

BOHN'S ANTIQUARIAN LIBRARY.

22. **PAULI'S LIFE OF ALFRED THE GREAT.** To which is appended **ALFRED'S ANGLO-SAXON VERSION OF OROSIUS,** with a literal translation. Notes, and an Anglo-Saxon Grammar and Glossary, by B. THORPE, Esq.

24 & 25. **MATTHEW OF WESTMINSTER'S FLOWERS OF HISTORY,** especially such as relate to the affairs of Britain, from the beginning of the world to A.D. 1307. Translated by C. D. YONGE, B.A. In 2 Vols.

26. **LEPSIUS'S LETTERS FROM EGYPT, ETHIOPIA,** and the **PENINSULA OF SINAI.** Revised by the Author. Translated by LEONORA and JOANNA B. HORNER. With Maps and Coloured View of Mount Barkal.

27, 28, & 30. **ORDERICUS VITALIS.** His Ecclesiastical History of England and Normandy, translated, with Notes and the Introduction of Guizot, by T. FORESTER, M.A. In 3 Vols.

29. **INGULPH'S CHRONICLE OF THE ABBEY OF CROYLAND,** with the Continuations by Peter of Blois and other Writers. Translated, with Notes and an Index, by H. T. RILEY, B.A.

32. **LAMB'S SPECIMENS OF ENGLISH DRAMATIC POETS** of the time of Elizabeth; including his Selections from the Garrick Plays.

33. **MARCO POLO'S TRAVELS,** the translation of Marsden, edited, with Notes and Introduction, by T. WRIGHT, M.A., F.S.A., &c.

34. **FLORENCE OF WORCESTER'S CHRONICLE,** with the Two Continuations; comprising Annals of English History, from the Departure of the Romans to the Reign of Edward I. Translated, with Notes, by T. FORESTER, Esq.

35. **HAND-BOOK OF PROVERBS,** comprising the whole of Ray's Collection, and a complete Alphabetical Index, in which are introduced large Additions collected by HENRY G. BOHN.

BOHN'S PHILOLOGICAL LIBRARY.

Uniform with the STANDARD LIBRARY, *price 5s. per Volume.*

1. **TENNEMANN'S MANUAL** of the **HISTORY** of **PHILOSOPHY,** revised and continued by J. R. MORELL.

2. **ANALYSIS** and **SUMMARY** of **HERODOTUS,** with synchronistical Table of Events, Tables of Weights, Money, &c.

3. **TURNER'S (DAWSON W.) NOTES TO HERODOTUS,** for the use of Students. With Map, Appendices, and Index.

4. **LOGIC,** or the **SCIENCE OF INFERENCE,** a popular Manual, by J. DEVEY.

5. **ANALYSIS** and **SUMMARY** of **THUCYDIDES,** by T. WHEELER. New Edition, with the addition of a complete Index.

BOHN'S BRITISH CLASSICS.

Uniform with the STANDARD LIBRARY, *price 3s. 6d. per Volume.*

1, 3, 5, 8, 11 & 14. **GIBBON'S ROMAN EMPIRE**; Complete and Unabridged, with variorum Notes, including, in addition to all the Author's own, those of Guizot, Wenck, Niebuhr, Hugo, Neander, and other foreign scholars. Edited by an ENGLISH CHURCHMAN, *with Portrait and Maps.*

2, 4, & 6. **ADDISON'S WORKS,** with the Notes of BISHOP HURD. *With Portrait and Engravings on Steel.*

7. **DEFOE'S WORKS,** Edited by SIR WALTER SCOTT. Vol 1. Containing the Life, Adventure, and Piracies of Captain Singleton, and the Life of Colonel Jack. *Portrait of Defoe.*

9 **DEFOE'S WORKS,** Vol. 2. Containing Memoirs of a Cavalier, Adventures of Captain Carleton, Dickory Cronke, &c.

10. **PRIOR'S LIFE OF BURKE.** (forming the 1st Volume of BURKE'S WORKS), new Edition, revised by the Author. *Portrait.*

12. **BURKE'S WORKS,** Vol 1, containing his Vindication of Natural Society, Essay on the Sublime and Beautiful, and various Political Miscellanies.

13. **DEFOE'S WORKS,** Edited by SIR WALTER SCOTT. Vol. 3. Containing the Life of Moll Flanders, and the History of the Devil.

15. **BURKE'S WORKS.** Vol. 2, containing Essay on the French Revolution, Political Letters and Speeches.

BOHN'S ECCLESIASTICAL LIBRARY.

Uniform with the STANDARD LIBRARY, *price 5s. per Volume.*

1. **EUSEBIUS' ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY,** Translated from the Greek, with Notes.

2. **SOCRATES' ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY,** in continuation of EUSEBIUS, with the Notes of VALESIUS.

3. **THEODORET AND EVAGRIUS.** Ecclesiastical Histories, from A.D. 332 to A.D. 427, and from A.D. 431 to A.D. 544. Translated from the Greek, with General Index.

4. **THE WORKS OF PHILO JUDÆUS,** translated from the Greek by C. D. YONGE, B.A. Vol. 1.

5. **PHILO JUDÆUS,** Vol. 2.

6. **SOZOMEN'S ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY** from A.D. 324–440: and the Ecclesiastical History of PHILOSTORGIUS, translated from the Greek, with a Memoir of the Author, by E. WALFORD, M.A.

7. **PHILO JUDÆUS,** Vol. 3.

BOHN'S SHILLING SERIES.

*Those marked *, being Double Volumes, are* 1*s.* 6*d.*

1. EMERSON'S REPRESENTATIVE MEN.
2. IRVING'S LIFE OF MAHOMET.*
3. THE GENUINE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF BENJAMIN FRANKLIN.
4. WILLIS'S PEOPLE I HAVE MET.*
5. IRVING'S SUCCESSORS OF MAHOMET.*
6. ——— LIFE OF GOLDSMITH.*
7. ——— SKETCH-BOOK.*
8. ——— TALES OF A TRAVELLER.*
9. ——— TOUR ON THE PRAIRIES.
10 & 11. —— CONQUESTS OF GRANADA AND SPAIN. 2 Vols.*
12 & 13. —— LIFE OF COLUMBUS 2 Vols.*
14. ——— COMPANIONS OF COLUMBUS.*
15 & 16. TAYLOR'S EL DORADO; or, Pictures of the Gold Region. 2 Vols.
17. IRVING'S ADVENTURES OF CAPTAIN BONNEVILLE.*
18. ——— KNICKERBOCKER.*
19. ——— TALES OF THE ALHAMBRA.*
20. ——— CONQUEST OF FLORIDA.*
21. ——— ABBOTSFORD AND NEWSTEAD.
22. ——— SALMAGUNDI.*
23. ——— BRACEBRIDGE HALL.*
24. ——— ASTORIA (*Portrait of the Author*). 2 Vols. in 1. 2*s.*
25. LAMARTINE'S GENEVIEVE; or, The History of a Servant Girl. Translated by A. R. SCOBLE.*
26. MAYO'S BERBER; or, The Mountaineer of the Atlas. A Tale of Morocco.
27. WILLIS'S LIFE HERE AND THERE; or, Sketches of Society and Adventure.*
28. GUIZOT'S LIFE OF MONK, with Appendix and *Portrait*.*
29. THE CAPE AND THE KAFFIRS: A Diary of Five Years' Residence, with Advice to Emigrants. By H. WARD. *Plate and Map of the Seat of War.* 2*s.*
30. WILLIS'S HURRY-GRAPHS; or, Sketches of Scenery, Celebrities, and Society, taken from Life.*
31. HAWTHORNE'S HOUSE OF THE SEVEN GABLES. A Romance.
32. LONDON AND ITS ENVIRONS; with Historical and Descriptive Sketch of the Great Exhibition. By CYRUS REDDING. *Numerous Illustrations.* 2*s.*
33. LAMARTINE'S STONEMASON OF SAINT POINT.*
34. GUIZOT'S MONK'S CONTEMPORARIES. A Series of Biographic Studies on the English Revolution. *Portrait of Edward Lord Clarendon.*
35. HAWTHORNE'S TWICE-TOLD TALES.
36. ——— The same, Second Series.
37. ——— SNOW IMAGE, and other Tales.
38. ——— SCARLET LETTER.
39. EMERSON'S ORATIONS AND LECTURES.
40. UNCLE TOM'S CABIN; or, Life among the Lowly; with Introductory Remarks by the REV. J. SHERMAN.
41. THE WHITE SLAVE. A new picture of American Slave Life.
42. DAYS OF BATTLE; or, Quatre Bras and Waterloo. By an ENGLISHWOMAN, resident at Brussels in June, 1815, (author of Rome in the Nineteenth Century).

43. GERVINUS' INTRODUCTION TO THE HISTORY OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY, translated from the German (*with a Memoir of the Author*).

44. CARPENTER'S (DR. W. B.) PHYSIOLOGY OF TEMPERANCE AND TOTAL ABSTINENCE, being an Examination of the Effects of the excessive, moderate, and occasional use of Alcoholic Liquors on the Human System (or *on fine paper, bound in cloth*, 2*s*. 6*d*.)

BOHN'S MINIATURE LIBRARY.

Foolscap 12*mo*. *elegantly bound in morocco cloth.*

BARBAULD AND AIKIN'S EVENINGS AT HOME. *Frontispieces.* 3*s*.

BOURRIENNE'S MEMOIRS OF NAPOLEON. *Portrait and Frontisp.* 3*s*. 6*d*.

BUNYAN'S PILGRIM'S PROGRESS. With a Life and Notes by SCOTT, containing all in Southey's Edition. 25 *Woodcuts, by* HARVEY, *Frontisp.* &c. 3*s*. 6*d*.

——— CHEEVER'S LECTURES ON, *Frontisp.* 2*s*. 6*d*.

BYRON'S POETICAL WORKS, in 1 thick Volume, including several suppressed Poems not included in other editions. *Beautiful Frontispiece.* 3*s*. 6*d*.

——— DON JUAN, complete. *Frontispieces.* 2*s*. 6*d*.

COLERIDGE'S SELECT POETICAL WORKS. 2*s*.

COWPER'S POETICAL WORKS, with Life by SOUTHEY, including all the copyright Poems (700 pages). *Beautiful Frontispieces after* HARVEY, *by* GOODALL. 3*s*. 6*d*.

DRYDEN'S POETICAL WORKS, complete in 1 Vol., with *a Portrait, Frontispiece, and Vignette Title.* 3*s*. 6*d*.

ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF MANNERS AND ETIQUETTE, comprising an improved edition of Chesterfield's Advice to his Son on Men and Manners. 2*s*.

HEBER'S (BP.) & MRS. HEMANS' POETICAL WORKS. 3 Vols. in 1. *Fronts.* 2*s*. 6*d*.

HERRICK'S POETICAL WORKS, complete. *Frontispiece.* 3*s*.

JOE MILLER'S JEST BOOK. *Frontispiece.* 3*s*.

LONGFELLOW'S POETICAL WORKS, viz.—Voices of the Night—Evangeline—Seaside and Fireside—Spanish Students—Translations. *Portrait and Frontisp.* 2*s*. 6*d*.

——— PROSE WORKS, viz.—Outre-Mer—Hyperion—Kavanagh. 2*s*. 6*d*.

MILTON'S POETICAL WORKS, with Life and Notes by DR. STEBBING; and Dr. Channing's Essay on Milton. *Frontispiece.* 3*s*. 6*d*.

NEW JOE MILLER, a Selection of Modern Jests, Witticisms, Droll Tales, &c. 2*s*. 6*d*.

OSSIAN'S POEMS, with Dissertations by MACPHERSON and Dr. Blair. *Frontisp.* 3*s*.

POPE'S HOMER'S ILIAD. Essay on Homer. Notes and Essays. *Frontispiece.* 3*s*.

——— ODYSSEY, (uniform). *Frontispiece.* 3*s*.

SCOTT'S POETICAL WORKS, and Life, in one volume. *Port. and Frontisp.* 3*s*. 6*d*.

STURM'S REFLECTIONS ON THE WORKS OF GOD. *Frontisp.* 3*s*.

THOMPSON'S SEASONS. With his Castle of Indolence, 4 *beautiful Woodcuts.* 2*s*.

VATHEK, AND THE AMBER WITCH. 2 vols. in 1. 2*s*. 6*d*.

D102 .M64 v.2
History,
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00021 5956